

STUDIES IN

MODERN WORLD

SATISH KUMAR

AS STUDY CIRCLE

153.94

~~153.94~~

SAT

BOOKHIVE PUBLICATION

STUDIES IN
MODERN WORLD

18000

STUDIES IN MODERN WORLD

(According to Latest Syllabus)
FOR
CIVIL SERVICES (MAIN) EXAM.

5th (Revised & Enlarged Edition)

by

SATISH KUMAR

I.A.S. Study Circle

New Delhi

BOOKHIVE

PUBLISHERS FOR COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS

CB-231, RING ROAD, NARAINA

NEW DELHI-110028

Phone : 536707

Published by

BOOKHIVE

CB-231, Ring Road, Naraina
NEW DELHI-110028.

ಬಿ. ಎಂ. ಶ್ರೀ ಸ್ಮಾರಕ ಪ್ರತಿಷ್ಠಾಪನ
ಗ್ರಂಥ ಭಂಡಾರ

ಕ್ರಮ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.....16000.....

© Reserved by Author

ವರ್ಗ ಕೆ.ಎಸ್.ರಮಣಮಣಿ ಅವರ ಕೊಡುಗೆ

ವರ್ಗ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ.....

ಬಂದ ತಾ||1/7/05.....

ಬೆಲೆ.....ರೂ. 40/-.....

Price : Rupees Forty only

153.94
SAT

12043

Read its Companion Volumes

1. Ancient and Medieval India (2nd Revised Edition)
(Combined) Rs. 55.00
2. Modern India Rs. 28.00

Printed through

Gitanjali Print Craft

at PAL-MOHAN PROCESS,

C.B. 19/5, Shanker Market,

Ring Road, Naraina,

NEW DELHI-110028

5th Preface

The present volume has been so designed as to meet the needs of the candidates appearing for the Civil Services (MAIN) Examination. It has been prepared keeping strictly in view the syllabus laid down.

This volume has been adequately revised. In fact the main objective of this work is to provide a comprehensive survey of the main issues of history. The treatment is topical and such an approach has the advantage of clarity and simplicity. The material has been presented in a readable form. For those who have not studied history, it presents the facts in a proper perspective to make comprehension and understanding easier and for those who have studied the subject it provides useful relevant supplementary material.

In the end I wish to express my sincere thanks to messrs Bookhive for the keen interest they have taken in the production of this book.

Any suggestions for improvement of the book are welcome.

September, 1983

SATISH KUMAR

Contents

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Age of Mercantilism and the beginning of Capitalism. ...	9
2. Agricultural Revolution in Western Europe (16th to 18th Century). ...	17
3. Technological Revolution Leading to factories-Industries. ...	26
4. Development of Capitalism. ...	40
5. Imperialism. ...	56
6. Aims, Achievements and character of the French Revolution (1789-95). ...	76
7. The Origins of Modern Nationalism (The unification of Italy and Germany) ...	147
8. Rise of Liberalism in Britain in the 19th Century. ...	163
9. The Russian Revolution of 1917. ...	180
10. Nazism in Germany. ...	195
11. Stages of Colonialism in India, Mercantilism, Free Trade and Finance Capital. ...	245
12. Dutch Colonialism in Indonesia in the 19th Century ...	257
13. Egypt—Its history and Colonization of its Economy (from 1876-1920) ...	269

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 14. | The Opium War and the Development of the Treaty Port System in China (1840-1860). ... | 274 |
| 15. | The Anti-Imperialist Movements in Indonesia, Indo-China, Egypt and China, (The revolution in China, 1919-1949). ... | 288 |

Age of Mercantilism and the Beginning of Capitalism

Mercantilism in practice is traceable to the beginning of the seventeenth century. It was one of the most important and widely accepted economic theory before the nineteenth century. Its use was closely linked with the rise and emergence of national states. The state governments afforded protection to and a support to economic ventures.

Mercantilism implies regulation by government of trade and industry and was known by different names in different places *e.g.* Colbertism in France and Cameralism in Germany. However, it must be remembered that its basic features were the same.

Mercantilism

Many motives and ambitions both public and private which emerged in the minds of men had given rise to the policy known as mercantilism and this had manifested itself in the Navigation Laws. In order to understand their purpose one has to appreciate the growing importance of colonies. As a result of these acts the whole trade between England and the colonies was enclosed and protected and canalized in English shipping. The emphasis was to build up the value and volume of exports and correspondingly reduce the volume and value of imports. An emphasis had thus been placed

on the so called concept of the Balance of Trade which operated within the framework of Mercantilist thought and policy.

Throughout the seventeenth century the pressure of the merchant class on government grew and to this extent the form of polity to be found in the country certainly seemed to have been of lesser importance than generally assumed. There was thus an alliance or partnership in mercantilism. The king and governments visualized in the anticipated expansion of mercantile prosperity, the possibilities of larger revenues for themselves and of a prosperous and happy population over which to govern. On the other hand the merchants looked to the state as a helping hand and to protect their trading in far off countries, required the active assistance of royal embassies and the inevitable support and backing of government prestige. Armed protection was required to sail through hostile waters swarming with pirates and others. Not only this, at home the traders expected protection of yet another type—protection from competition from foreign importers. The up and coming and developing industries also required financial aid and assistance in the form of subsidies. For all this, the merchant class had inevitably to depend upon the Government.

However, what was true in England. *i.e.*, a more or less balanced partnership of government and the merchant class was not necessarily true of other European states where the pendulum tended to diverge on either side of this principle. In Italy and the Netherlands, the tilt was towards private initiative and profit whereas in France it was towards excessive government control and domination.

The Mercantile system thus comprised of various devices—legislative, administrative and regulatory by—means of which predominantly agrarian societies sought to transform themselves into trading and industrial societies. Catherine the Great regarded the English as “first and always traders” whereas Sir Josiah Child asserted that “profit and power ought jointly to be considered”. To Hobbes is attributed the statement “wealth is power and power is wealth”. The years in which mercantilism developed was really an age when the pursuit of economic enterprises demanded and in fact needed

the backing of a strong political force. This was also an age of economic expansion and this often led to plunder, violence and even warfare and this unnecessary pursuit for economic gains and the acquisition of wealth probably accounts for the rapid material progress of the West.

Mercantilists held that the wealth of a nation was measured in precious metals. As Locke once put it "Riches do not consist in having more gold and silver but in having more in proportion than the rest of the world or than one's neighbours—who sharing the gold and silver of the world in less proportion want the means of plenty and power and so are the poorer." As a consequence the rulers in Europe intentionally launched policies aimed at increasing wealth by means of Mercantilism. Not only this it implied that there ought to be a favourable balance of trade and that colonies existed only to provide raw materials as also markets for the Mother country. The direct corollary was that restrictions on trade and manufactures in the colonies were imposed to prevent them from becoming potential rivals to the commercial activities of the Mother country. These countries by following the policy of Mercantilism made their own states largely self sufficing and forced other states to be economically dependent on them.

The Mercantilists perforce had to lay stress on a favourable balance of trade since there were inadequate credit facilities and paper currencies. The government needed bullion for domestic trade and for purchases made abroad. What is significant is that the relative importance attached by mercantilists to foreign trade, industry and agriculture was different at different times and even from country to country. Heckscher in his book "Mercantilism" praises the noble profession of the merchant who deserves all favour as being the best and most profitable member of the common wealth." "Commerce", it was said in France during the reign of Louis XIV, "provides the riches of towns and state".

To what extent the mercantilists succeeded in promoting economic development is a debatable matter. One thing is clear that Colbert during his lifetime had ensured the maintenance of a large army and navy in France which became a

threat to Europe for the fear of French domination became real. Heckscher termed French mercantilism a failure when judged by British standards. The British attributed their success to the comparative freedom from government control and the unnecessary regulations and incessant government interference which was a feature of continental mercantilism. The significance of Mercantilism lies in the fact as Prof. Lutge asserts that it educated people to approach economic problems rationally and instilled a new ethos of work.

Mercantilism certainly involved state planning. "Trade", said Colbert, "is the source of public finance and public finance is the vital nerve of war." During the heyday of mercantilism in Central Europe the Hapsburgs built up a standing army larger than the French. Frederick the Great of Prussia was able to repair the damage before his death caused to his state by the seven years war. To Frederick it seemed the means by which Prussia in his own words was lifted "out of the dust".

The Hohenzollern and Hapsburg rulers believed that mercantilism though it stood for state control, never meant state ownership and as a result encouraged the development of initiative within the domain of state policies as laid down by them.

Mercantilism or Commercialism of Central Europe was different from its French counterpart because the study of its doctrines constituted an academic discipline which was obligatory for all the holders of administrative posts and its rulers were its most receptive students.

Criticism Levelled Against Mercantilism

The Mercantilists believed that the possession of a particular specie meant prosperity for the state. This has been proved unsound together with its salient features. Holding that a colony existed only for the benefit of the Mother country was not a good economic proposition but also a source of considerable trouble in colonial affairs. Many European governments practised paternalism. The English government undertook to control labour and to fix prices while the French government under the direction of Colbert

succeeded in establishing government control of guilds, dug canals, drained swamps and constructed public buildings. The Prussian government was all for subordinating everything to the interest of the state in times of war.

A new school of thought—the physiocrats—whose chief exponent was the Frenchman Quesnay—Louis XV's doctor, contended that the state ought to refrain from the regulation of the economic affairs in the state excepting enforcing contracts and protecting life and prosperity. The physiocrats argued that wealth could come only from investment and therefore condemned unproductive investment in military ventures and stressed the need to give the industrial the incentive to produce and must be freed from the burdens of excessive taxation from the restrictions imposed by the communal system of agriculture, by the control exercised by guilds, and by the state regulation of trade and industry. The physiocrats insisted that the individual must possess his property and dispose it off as he chose. They concluded—and by this means appeared to bridge the gulf between the needs of the individual and those of the community. In other words what they wanted was individualism competition and free trade should be established and protected by the state. The slogan of the physiocrats was *laissez faire* (let them do as they will). Their chief assertion was the interest and welfare of both the individual and the groups best served when each individual seeks his interests in a competitive society. Since restrictive laws were the cause of human suffering and misery they should be abolished and give way to *laissez faire* with its far reaching prospects of individual development and happiness.

The theory of the physiocrats found favour in a predominantly agricultural France but not in industrialised England. Adam Smith (1723-90) said of them that “their system with all its imperfections, is perhaps the nearest approximation to the truth that has yet been published on the subject.” Not only this Adam Smith in his famous book—“The Wealth of Nations” modified the doctrine of Quesnay and was able to present it in a much more convincing manner. He was always wary of the traders for he believed that “their interest is

never exactly the same with that of the public". Adam Smith advocated the abolition of monopolies and all regulations of industry. He went on to say that every one should pursue his own interests.

Importance of Adam Smith and his school of thought

The laissez faire doctrine found ready acceptance at the hands of the capitalist manufacturers since they wanted non-interference by the government in business enterprises. Economist like Robert Malthus (1766-1834), James Mill (1773-1836), David Ricardo (1772-1823) and Nassau Senior (1790-1864) established a new school of thought—the classical economists. Their philosophy appeared to be more acceptable to the developing industrial age than mercantilism would have been.

Beginning of Capitalism

Capitalism was in reality an outgrowth of the commercial revolution. Capitalism in a way implies a large scale business organisation conducted by an individual or a group of persons having sufficient resources to purchase raw materials and tools and to engage labour in order to produce more items for profit. Capitalism has the inherent tendency to lead to concentration of wealth in the hands of the few and to promote big industrial ventures. A necessary corollary is the establishment of a banking system which ensures credit and the flow of capital.

Many important changes followed in the wake of the commercial revolution. Business was no longer a personal affair. The existing practice of not loaning money for interest was removed. The possession of wealth was not any longer regarded as unreligious and immoral. Profits were regarded honourable. Competition and bargaining as essential attributes of business enterprise were recognised.

Banking

Essential to the growth of trade and commercial enterprise was banking and it soon developed on a large scale. It was

certainly not an innovation. For it had been used, though in a limited way by the Jewish and Syrian money changers long before the 16th century. Banking was also prevalent though on a limited scale in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The Medici family of Florence established the first great banking system in the 16th century. Money was looked upon and treated as a commodity and the result was huge profit. Banking institutions soon came into existence in Holland, Sweden, Spain, England, Australia. The capitalistic system is dependent largely on the successful operation of a banking system.

The success of commercial and financial capitalism during the 16th and 18th centuries was due to the extensive opportunities for making profits from foreign trade and finance and the expansion of personal movable wealth and the mobility of capital. Much of the traders profits were put back into the firm in the form of greater liquidity, bigger stocks, advances to local producers and participation in international exchange transactions. Not only this improved commercial and financial techniques opened new vistas for the merchants to invest profits outside their own firms.

Innovations in public finance exercised a very significant influence on the development of European economy. These innovations of the sixteenth century inspired the rulers of Europe to undertake grandiose world policies, but proved inadequate to satisfy the tremendous requirements of money and credit that resulted from it. The gap between need and opportunities to exercise irresponsible pressure on the commercial money markets, resulting in the dislocation of economic expansion and to tremendous state bankruptcies. No matter how disruptive the bankruptcies of the state may have been, yet in the long run these formed the first important step in the systematic development of a consolidated, national debt. In France where mercantilism had resulted in the grand schemes of military expansion during the reign of Louis XIV, the improvements in the technique of public finance led to wasteful state expenditure, which in turn did nothing in the field of economic development of the country and only succeeded in initiating serious financial crisis. In England, on the other

hand, mercantilism was utilized to promote economic expansion, and the reinforcement of financial techniques led to the creation of a modern economy.

Significance of the Introduction of Capitalism

The introduction of capitalism was responsible for eventually bringing to an end the economic system of the Middle Ages. The old manorial system collapsed. The nobles shifted to towns and engaged themselves in commercial enterprise and obtained rents from the peasants who occupied their estates. Capitalism destroyed the prestige, power and importance of guilds and revolutionised industry. The capitalists were favourably placed and could collect large stocks and thus had better capacity to buy and sell as compared to the guilds. The initial steps in the direction of an industrial and agricultural revolution had been taken and a new economic and social order was emerging. Before we read more about the development of capitalism and its spread, we now turn our attention to another important and significant revolution--the Agricultural revolution in Western Europe.

The Agricultural Revolution in Western Europe (16th to 18th century)

The change in the position of agriculture may really be considered a part of the Industrial Revolution. Even though agriculture was the main occupation till the 17th century, no improvements had been introduced or made. The same methods and tools of ages gone by continued to be used. New crops were only introduced in Europe after the voyages of discovery and the crusades. The main reasons for the significant absence of improvements was due to a lack of demand for agricultural products beyond the home consumption. All the manufacturers produced what was needed by them. The demand for agricultural products only began with the coming into existence of large cities.

Character of the Revolution

The agricultural revolution brought in its wake the introduction of machinery, new crops, drainage of waste lands, the use of fertilisers, and improvement in stock breeding. It also led to the enclosure of the common land and the emphasis of land into large holdings. What caused these was the desire for increased production coupled with profits.

During the period 1500-1800, almost half the working population continued to be still engaged in agriculture and

even the non-agricultural aspects of the pre-industrial economy was inter-related to rural activities. Agriculture remained the most important factor on the economy as a whole.

Before 1800, farming in most parts of Europe was heavily based in favour of corn production during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the cultivation of buckle wheat had become more common in western and central Europe and rice and maize were introduced in southern Europe. These however did not change the tradition of a single crop cultivation in many regions. The change occurred only when potatoes began to be grown in large quantities on the fields.

The production of corn provided the farmer with the opportunity of consuming a part of what he produced or even the total quantity. The production was limited because of lack of labour force and the lack of technical developments and improvements. The area under cultivation was therefore limited and never rose above a certain maximum. The agricultural produce was in reality meant only for the total number of farm workers and *vice versa*,

Production was more or less the same on all the farms, though obviously the small farms were less efficient than the bigger ones. The production of each farm varied from year to year. From this fluctuating production a "fixed" amount had to be kept for "seeds" and for domestic consumption, for feeding the household. As a result, a different proportion of the crop production reached the markets each year. The inevitable consequence was that the market price was influenced by the fluctuations in supply. Sharp price fluctuations were a predominant feature of the grain prices during the 16th to 18th century.

Reclamation of land

In many countries the area under cultivation increased during the second half of the fifteenth century. This period of expansion came to an end in some countries at the end of the seventeenth century while it continued in others till 1860. What contributed to this increased acreage under cultivation was the rise in agrarian prices as compared with other commodities.

Part of the reclamation of land during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was in reality the recovery of ground that had been abandoned during the agricultural depression and the decline in population after 1300. During the seventeenth century efforts to open up new lands came to an end in almost all European countries. After 1660 drainage and reclamation in the Netherlands and East Germany continued on a limited scale. Historical studies have revealed that the number of deserted villages in the seventeenth century in France, Spain, Italy, Greece, Germany, England and Poland was not as large as that in the Middle Ages. The shrinkage of cultivable land was a general European phenomenon and the wars together with the plague during the seventeenth century were not the only contributory factors. A decline in acreage, accompanied by a fall in prices can also be explained by a fall in population and this has been established by the available demographic data.

In the German lands, so badly devastated in the thirty years war, an improvement was noticeable during the last twenty years of the seventeenth century and in other countries like the Austria, Netherlands, France, Russia and England reclamation of land began only during the second half of the eighteenth century.

During the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century agriculture was not on the same level everywhere in Europe, small intensive areas of farming were to be found everywhere. What is not certain is whether the situation in 1800 differed greatly from that in 1500. Certain areas of intensive farming had suffered badly in Germany as a consequence of the Thirty Years War while the situation had definitely improved in England and some of the Dutch provinces and during the eighteenth century in Northern Germany.

A lot has been said about the agricultural revolution which took place in the eighteenth century. However a clear scrutiny makes it clear that agriculture during the period did not undergo great revolutionary changes. There was, no doubt, some improvement and expansion in areas where intensive farming had been used for a long time. The actual development really increased in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and this was on a much larger scale,

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries some of the following systems of tillage were practised side by side :

- (1) Temporary cultivation still used in countries like Ireland, Sweden and Scotland.
- (2) The two course rotation in Southern France and England.
- (3) Three course rotation with two years fallow.
- (4) Three course rotation with one year fallow.
- (5) A rotation of four, five six or more courses generally combined with the cultivation of pulses as in England and the Netherlands.
- (6) Convertible husbandry in which the land was cultivated for several years and then converted into pastures for a period of time as in Flanders, England Alsace, Schlesurg Holstein.

The advantage of convertible husbandry was that under the system corn was sown only in five out of eleven years where as in the old three course rotation grain was grown for two out of every three years. Thus in the former system land could be used as pasture for five years and there was only one year when land was left fallow every eleven years while the three course system involved four years of fallow every twelve years.

Two systems of tillage became well known during the eighteenth century—the Norfolk system in England and the convertible husbandry of Schlesureg Holstein and Denmark. In the Norfolk system wheat and barley alternated with the growing of fodder, turnips and cloves.

Further during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the production of grain and its demand were affected by the cultivation of good crops that could replace corn, for example rice, maize, potatoes. When and how these crops became an essential part of the diet of the people is difficult to determine. In the case of potatoes this was indeed a rapid process for potatoes were hardly known in some countries of Europe around the year 1750. By the end of the eighteenth century, potatoes had become a part of the staple diet. What is interesting to note is that in some areas potatoes replaced pulses and not corn and even beans, peas and carrots lost their importance.

It appears that rice was first cultivated in North Italy in the second half of the seventeenth century. After 1730 Europe imported large quantities of rice from North America. Maize became popular in Italy after 1630 and had become an important part of the diet of the Portuguese by the second half of the seventeenth century and an important item of the Spanish cereal cultivation by the middle of the eighteenth century. The cultivation of buckle wheat increased rapidly in Western Germany and the low countries in the second half of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century.

The Enclosures and allied changes

The outstanding features of medieval agriculture were the open fields and fragmented land holdings together with collective constraints. The process of consolidation of land holdings is by no means a recent invention. In fact there had been numerous examples, of consolidations in many countries and throughout the centuries. The most commonly mentioned are the enclosures in England but similar process had been applied in varying degrees in many other parts of Europe.

What led to the desire for consolidation was the inclination to introduce new agricultural techniques that had begun to be applied in England. Equally important was the increase in population in European villages which led to increased fragmentation of the land.

The initiative in the enclosure movement in England was taken by the landlords. The landed gentry that dominated the English Parliament realized that they could make larger profits if the small farms were combined to make large farms which would profitably use new agricultural methods. Beginning about 1790 laws—Enclosure Acts—were passed to turn public land to private ownership and landlords were able to secure control of 7,000,000 acres of land. Many of the farms were combined to form big farms which were fenced in. Even since that time England became a country of big estates. While this aided in the development of agriculture, it caused serious hardship. Many, who had used the common pastures for pasturage were deprived of their rights. Most of the dispossessed farmers became workers in factories, from labourers or

vagabonds. Scientific farming and machinery had helped them little. A popular poem of the time expressed their opinion.

“The law locks up the man or woman who steals the goose from off the common ;

But leaves the greater villian loose, who steals the common from the goose”.

The second largest success of land consolidation was in Scandinavia followed by Northern Germany. The compelling motive was an increased demand for agricultural products and the desire to increase production. In both cases the drive towards consolidation was promoted by the government.

Crop Rotation and Scientific Farming

Since the earliest times the process of agriculture had been hampered by an important physical factor, i.e. the tendency of the soil to lose its fertility under continuous cultivation. Prior to the modern period, the methods employed to check this tendency were principally three viz. the rise of annual manure, the practice of fallowing and the alternation of crops. Owing to the absence of winter roots and the consequent difficulty of keeping animals alive during the winter season the medieval farmers could not rear more than a few cattle. The small number of cattle on the medieval farms restricted the supply of natural manure and were compelled to adopt other methods of restoring the fertility of the soil. The alternation of crops in the three field system did not permit the farmer to dispense with fallowing. He was compelled to continue fallowing and alternation. But the system was a wasteful one since it involved leaving one third of the cultivated area idle every year. The obvious defect in agricultural practice was not removed until the 18th century when the introduction of green crops and winter roots made it possible to dispense with the fallowing practice. It led to a complete revolution in the art and practices of agriculture and indirectly produced important changes in the social and economic position of the cultivators. The traditional three course rotation gave way to a new four course rotation e.g. wheat, clover, barley and turnips. It

was Lord Tanstend who had advocated this and thereby making it possible for the total utilization of cultivable land available.

Considerable improvement of tools took place in the eighteenth century. The new plough based on the light English iron ploughs was the most significant element of improvement in agricultural technology. Along with the plough, the harrow was also improved. It was Jetbro Tull an Englishman who blazed a trail in scientific agriculture. He invented a seed drill which planted seeds uniformly. He also advised farmers to use a horse pulled cultivator to loosen up the soil and pull up weeds.

Although the iron plough had begun to be used, it was an American, Cyrus McCormick who invented the reaper in 1834. It was a boon for the agriculturists and soon threshers and cultivators began to be used. The English government established a Board of Agriculture (1793) to encourage scientific farming. Many of the new ideas were popularised by Arthur Young (1741-1820) by means of his writings. As a consequence of the Agricultural revolution departments of agriculture and agricultural colleges were established.

The eighteenth century agricultural experimenters had tried to build up soil fertility by the use of crop rotations with nitrogen accumulating crops and by the intensive use of animal manure. Around 1840 a German Van Lebeg in Germany, Boussingault in France, Lawes in England showed how chemistry could convert poor soil into a fertile one. They also almost simultaneously found formulas for chemical manures which led to the modern fertilizer industry.

Other Countries

Progress in agriculture was also made in other European countries, though till 1840 only England had made much of the Industrial Revolution. At this time France was still on the way to industrialisation. France lacked sufficient coal and iron. Besides the French Revolution had made France a land of small farmers even though the manorial system and serfdom had been done away with before the outbreak of the

revolution of 1789. The physiocrats had drawn attention to the basic value of agriculture.

In Germany, the Junker class devoted special attention to agriculture, economic planning was encouraged, land was enclosed, careful selection of seed and scientific stock breeding were studied and applied. Germany in reality began to make startling progress after it was unified in 1791. As Britain led the old Industrial Revolution in Europe so did Germany lead the new. The Germans in order to increase their agricultural production made extensive use of science.

Spain though rich in mineral remained industrially backward and Italy became industrialized since the Italian unification in 1870. However, so far as agriculture was concerned both Spain and Italy remained agriculturally backward countries, as they were handicapped by a somewhat feudal land holding system and primitive methods.

Most of Eastern Europe, however, continued to lag behind both in agricultural and Industrial Revolutions.

However, the increased production of the new Industrial and Agricultural Revolutions resulted in a tremendous increase in worldwide commerce. Consequently the nations of the world have become more and more dependent upon one another.

Farming and Capitalism

Influence in society has long been dependent on the possession of land. The land owners were considered superior to the merchants and manufacturers, irrespective of how much money the latter might possess. Through control of land political prestige could be obtained. This became one important means by which the capitalist could rival the hereditary aristocracy and he did not lose any opportunity to take advantage of it. The gentlemen farmers took personal pride in improving their land and became the exponents of improved agriculture. Besides there was the opportunity of making money from agriculture. The wars and population increase raised the price of agricultural products and made cultivation a profitable enterprise. More than any one else the capitalist contributed to break down the medieval system which had

hindered progress in farming. Science was now employed in agriculture to produce more at less cost.

The agricultural revolution in Western Europe during the 16th to 18th centuries led us on to the Technological Revolution which started developments that were destined to effect almost all aspects of human life.

3

Technological Revolution Leading to Factories—Industries

While the spectacular drama of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars was being enacted on the continent of Europe, an event of great significance was taking place in England. This was Technologically better known as the Industrial Revolution.

A marked feature of the industrial revolution was the large scale production which was characterised by a highly complex division of labour and a high degree of specialisation. An inevitable consequence of these developments on the technical side was the conversion of the so called domestic production into a system of large scale production and hence the only suitable form of organisation for the application of machinery on a large scale.

The outcome of these technical changes was a tremendous growth in the output of the English industries. This tremendous increase in output was the result of both the expansion and improvements of the old established industries and more particularly from a vast variety and multiplicity of new industries. Historically speaking the industrial development was perhaps less a matter of improvement in existing industries than of the increase of industries almost unknown until that time.

According to Mrs. Knowles the industrial revolution com-

prised six great developments all of which were interdependent. Firstly it involved the development of engineering. Engineers were required to make and prepare the steam engines, to make textile machinery and machinery for lifting coal out of the mines and to make machine tools and locomotives.

The second significant development was in the iron and steel industry. Since engineering was dependent on iron, a revolution in iron making necessarily preceded machinery. Before 1750, the iron industry in both England and France was scattered all over the countries near the woods to get charcoal for smelting and near water for power and the transport of bulky iron goods since roads were not yet developed. However a sound system of iron making was necessarily dependent on the invention of steam power which eventually freed the iron makers from the limitations of water power.

The third important development was in the sphere of textile industries. The earliest mechanical devices run by water or steam power were applied to the simple operation of spinning. This resulted in a surplus of yarn and weaving machines were developed to consume the yarn. This first applied to cotton followed by wool, flax and silk.

The third development led to the fourth. The bleaching, dyeing, finishing or printing process had all to be accelerated to keep pace with textile output and this meant the creation of chemical industries. This in turn required engineering plants with the consequent reaction of metallurgical industries which were already experiencing a fresh demand owing to the adoption of iron machinery in the textile industry.

Engineering, textile machinery, and chemical industries were all dependent on coal. Thus the development in the coal industry is the fifth great change that was part of the industrial revolution.

Finally the mass production by factories, the development of engineering and chemical works, the growth of coal mining could not have achieved their present day over-whelming importance had there been no corresponding development in the means of transport which facilitated the movement of food, raw materials and manufactured goods.

Why Industrial Revolution first came to England

According to Mrs. Knowles the explanation of this lies in the fact that the English population was relatively very small to deal with the growing export trade. The introduction of machinery was essential as there were not enough people to satisfy by handwork the increased demand. In order to cater for an export and import trade of 40 million pounds, France had 26 million people while Great Britain only had 9 million people to deal with a foreign trade of 32 million pounds. Thus France with her 26 million had plenty of available labour that could be occupied in domestic industrial production. (Thus according to Mrs. Knowles the fundamental factors leading to the initiation and completion of the industrial revolution in England in the sense of introduction of machinery factories and large scale production units was the shortage of labour and the other factors of production).

Lipson on the other hand, tries to counteract the view that inventions constitute the starting point of the present industrial society. He points out that long before the inventions England had, a vigorous manufacturing and mercantile life of her own. In connection with the origins of the Industrial Revolution, Bernie observes that outweighing all factors in importance was the fact that England alone among European nations had an extensively overseas empire. It was an example when trade followed the flag. Hence the possession of a vast overseas empire and the consequent enlargement of the market provided the greatest incentive for a Revolution in British industries.

Lipson agrees with the idea that the existence of markets abroad provided a great incentive for the adoption of inventions. Nevertheless he points out that it is only a part of the explanation, since France also made notable commercial strides in the 18th century, but was outstripped in the race for industrial supremacy. It can be concluded that the industrial revolution in England was the result of a combination of factors favourable to rapid industrialisation. In short England by this time had been able to create the essential pre-requisites for industrialisation and economic growth.

In the first place, prior to the inventions English industries,

commerce and banking were constituted on lines which served to make a large outlay on machinery and buildings practical and profitable. Secondly it was possible because England had accumulated sufficient capital for investment. The capital had been built up out of the profits on foreign trade. Thirdly the accumulation of capital was greatly helped by a change in ideas and attitudes which made it possible for the capitalistic spurt to assert itself. Fourthly there also existed a class of entrepreneurs equipped with the requisite technical qualities and organising abilities and accustomed to large scale production, the handling of labour force. The utilisation of credit instruments depended on imported materials and requirements of distant varied markets.

Fifthly one of the most essential and favouring objective of the Industrial Revolution in England became the early and remarkable development of inventions. The supreme position of U.K. in the field of inventions seems to be attributable to two things, 1) to the fact that the need for invention was very great and 2) the bent of English genius in the period under consideration was towards practical application of science while the continental scientists carried on research in light, electricity and chemical reactions.

Sixthly, the nature of English market was most helpful and favourable for mass scale mechanical production. The home market was composed of a substantial middle class enjoying a reasonably high standard of living. It consisted of manufacturers, traders, farmers, the better paid sections of artisans and peasants. The ownership of property was widely diffused. Since the nature of market determines the nature of the productive process the demand of the English people was for commodities which easily lent themselves for mechanical production without the loss of their essential qualities. Moreover the flexible trend of National consumption was responsive production, in a country where production was increasing, wages were advancing and wants were elastic.

Seventhly, the growth of population failed to keep pace with the expansion of commerce and industry. The textile industry exemplified the course of events in this period, e.g. in the textile industry the shortage of labour combined with

the comparatively high standard of wages furnished English producers with an inducement to avail themselves of mechanical methods which would economise the use of labour. Moreover, the hand spun yarn was neither uniform in quality nor strong enough to bear the strain of the power loom.

Eighthly the early exploitation of the coal resources stimulated the progress of industries. In a way coal provided the driving force for machinery and constituted the key to the industrial developments of the 18th century.

Ninthly, the institutional factors favouring the emergence of the Industrial Revolution were a strong political and National unity.

Tenthly, agricultural transformation or the agrarian revolution created important pre-requisites for industrialisation.

To sum up, the Industrial Revolution came first to England because she had expanding units both at home as well as abroad for her wares, because the nature of the wares was suitable for machine production, because there was a shortage of labour, because frequent inefficiency and relatively high price of labour stressed a motive to employment of mechanical devices, because the necessary resources were available for Investment, because, there existed run of enterprise with the energy to exploit new methods, because it lay in the logic of centuries of development as moulded by a variety of contributing influences.

Inventions

The series of inventions comprehended in the term Industrial Revolution took place in textile and iron industries. They were accompanied by notable improvement in the system of internal and external transport as well as an immense expansion of other branches of natural economy especially coal mining and engineering. According to Mrs. Knowles the industrial and commercial revolution hinge on coal and iron and the power to transport them. The decades with which the industrial revolution is traditionally associated cover the period 1760-1880 but these dates can be misleading as the events which are designated as industrial revolution

constituted no sudden breach with the existing economic order but were part of the continuous movement which had already made marked advance. The famous inventions associated with the names of Arkwright, James Watt, Stephenson and many others were the climax of a long series of industrial experiments extending over two centuries. If the earlier ages were barren of great technical achievement it was not due to want of ideas or energy. There were two improved impediments which retarded the progress of the invention of machinery. The fact that the initial stages are necessarily the slowest and most difficult it implies the use of laboriously accumulated wealth in fruitless enterprise in the absence of technical knowledge. Secondly the hostility displayed by the workers to labour saving devices was a discouragement to the inventive talent. It was feared that introduction of machinery would lead to unemployment and social unrest. However, gradually climate became favourable to the introduction of machines as there was a great necessity for economising labour in view of the increasing demand for English products. The 18th century came to be known as the century of inventions. In the first decade of the 18th century Abraham smelted iron ore with coke. In the second decade, Newcomen invented the steam engine to drain water from mines. In the fourth decade Kay invented the fly-shuttle in weaving and Paul in spinning by rollers which Arkwright later developed in the fifth decade. Paul invented a carding machine for preparing wool and Thentsman produced steam by what is known as crucible process. Thus in spite of obstacles society had not remained stagnant. It was continuously changing and the stage was being set for the coming of the factory age with power driven machinery, mass production and assemblage of workers under one roof.

In the textile industry all the processes such as carding, spinning, weaving and finishing were performed by hand. The era of the inventions was ushered in by John Kay. In 1733 he invented the fly-shuttle whose main feature was a new mode of casting of the shuttle by means of lever. It was driven mechanically without the help of the weavers hands. The next important invention was made

in connection with the spinning of thread. This stimulated the invention of a spinning machine. In 1764 James Hargreaves, a Lancashire weaver brought to completion his spinning genny which was a single simple machine operated by a hand wheel and carried at first eight threads which ultimately increased to 80. It could even be operated by a child but the thread spun was very weak and this deficiency was removed by the invention of the water frame by Arkwright in 1771. The thread spun by this machine was stronger and could stand the strain of the shuttle and loom. The introduction of the water frame was an event of prime importance in the history of textile manufactures. The water frame which was to be driven by some non-human power could not be set up in the ordinary cottage and could only be utilised profitably under commonly associated with the factory system. In 1779, Samuel Crompton brought together the best feature of Hargreaves, and Arkwright machines and it came to be known as the Mule which in its modern improved form carries 2000 spindles. The invention of Hargreaves, Arkwright, and Crompton gave the English textile industries a stimulus that was truly remarkable. Not only was the manufacture of woollen silks and linens increased in speed and amount but the production of cottons was brought into the forefront of profitable individuals. From 1784 onwards Edward Cartwright the inventor of the machine for wool combing gradually worked out the principles of the first power loom but it was adopted very gradually as there was tough resistance from the existing class of weavers.

The principle of the cylinder and piston was introduced by Newcomen. He introduced an engine which was of substantial service in pumping out water. In 1768, James Watt set himself the task of improving Newcomen's engine, chiefly in eliminating its waste of energy and making it more widely available for the purposes of manufacture. In 1769 Watt took his first patent he had brought the steam engine to such a form that it was adoptable for the first time to the operation of spinning machines, power looms, saw mills and other mechanical devices. The advances in the textiles trade were however conditioned by corresponding advances in the

metal industries. The equipment of the factories with spinning, weaving and other kinds of machinery required that there should be revolution in the process of machine manufacture. This in turn called for increased production and of course the cheapening of the necessary raw materials principally iron. Both the acquisition of these materials and the operation of the steam propelled machinery in all industries required that a vast and inexpensive supply of fuel should be made available.

Transportation

It was on land, rather than on sea, that the revolution in transport made its first beginning by the improvement of roads and more general use of steam vessels on inland waterways. This was necessitated by the tremendous increase in production and the need to explore new markets. The organisation of a road network was a reality in France and Great Britain by the end of the 18th century. About 1780 the journey from Manchester to London took 4-5 days. In 1820 36 hours were enough. About this year England had 21,000 miles of turnpike roads, as much as France. Then arrived Telford and Macadam on the scene in England to build public roads. Under the direction of Thomas Telford 900 miles of roads were opened across the mountains. John Macadam guaranteed a better quality and more uniform surface on the roads.

In general, the road system was the most satisfying one where industrialisation had proceeded farthest. The road map of Europe corresponded to that of the Industrial Revolution. It was only economic requirements that forced a high standard of maintenance, and kept the roads fit for wheeled traffic.

Canals

Since transportation by land was expensive, the English government began building canals. Strangely enough Great Britain, the founder of industrial civilization and the first country to have a large number of canals, was not really owed by geography for this method of transportation. This was because the sea makes numerous inroads into the heart of the

country, the nature of the land is uneven and the supply of water that feeds the streams is fairly limited, except at the estuaries. Canals in England in reality were the result largely of historical factors rather than natural endowments. These canals were able to transform the whole industrial order, as well as the markets for fuel and food.

There was no question of the continent discovering inland navigation. For centuries the northern plain of Europe from Flanders to Prussia had the advantage of a navigable network. It was only a question of adapting this traditional mode of navigation to the requirements of an industrial civilisation.

France once again took up the work of canal building begun at the end of the previous century and interrupted by the revolution (1789). In France as in England, canals remained to serve local traffic only.

Steam boats

Canals saved miles but the steam boat saved hours. Although experiments had been made earlier it was an American Robert Fulton, who is regarded as the builder of the first steam boat. It was in 1807 that Claremont of Fulton travelled 150 miles along the Hudson in 32 hours. Europe adopted this invention at once. The increase of steam navigation on the rivers made the problem of their "reconstruction" even more urgent. After about 1840, English Transatlantic steam boats were built of iron. The main reason why the English for years monopolised shipping trade of the world was due to their improved steam boats.

Steam Locomotives

Railways were the product of the reciprocal adaptation of trade and engine, both of which were closely limited to the revolution in metallurgy. Railways were cheaper to build and to run than canals. They could be used at all times of the year and provided relief for the over-crowded roads.

On the continent, the first railway also linked mines to water-ways. Without the locomotive, the railway line would have remained only of local importance. The steam engine had already made its appearance on the road and it was only

a matter of time and eventually George Stevenson an Englishman, invented his steam locomotive the Rocket, which won the Rainhill contest in 1829. From then on the locomotive was fully adopted to the trade and it helped considerably to expand the possibilities of the railway. Michel Chevalier going to Liverpool to sail for America in 1833 set foot into the railway carriage for the first time at Manchester and exclaimed "There are certain impressions one cannot put into words." Trains became a part of the new economic pattern they had helped to create. They were no longer speculative—they had become an institution.

The electric telegraph played an important part in this development. It alone could provide the railways, the security so essential for their successful operation and the telegraph networks developed along the path of the railway track. The Great Western were the first to introduce it in 1839. By 1848 half the railways possessed the telegraph. The link between telegraph and railway was important and continued to be so. The telegraph soon became a public service.

Whatever one may say, the century of the railway and the steamer marked a decisive period in the history of transport and that of the world.

Automobiles and Aeroplanes

A number of people contributed to the invention of the automobile including a German Daimler, who in 1855 produced a gasoline engine and an American, Goodyear, succeeded in vulcanising rubber in 1844. It was another American, Henry Ford whose untiring efforts made available the automobile within the reach of man with moderate means.

Even more than the railroad and the automobile, the aeroplane helped to shrink distances and bring people of the world closer together. The first flight by the Wright Brothers paved the way for an upheaval in commercial transportation and military methods.

Postal Services

The postal service of the ancient Persian empire was probably faster than that found in many parts of the civilized world.

in 1800. The costly unreliable and slow governmental postal service underwent a remarkable change when a blind Englishman Rowland Hill introduced a system of penny postage in Great Britain. He is rightly known as the father of the modern postal system. Other countries were quick to copy Hill's system and in 1874 the International Postal Union was established.

Other significant and far reaching inventions followed. Electricity was harnessed and applied to the Telegraph and the Telephone was followed by the wireless, radio and television.

The Factory System

It would be impossible to understand the world we live in without understanding the factory system. When Richard Arkwright herded scores of men, women and children together in buildings to run the new power driven machinery, he became the father of the factory system.

By 1800 there were several hundred factories in England and as the nineteenth century progressed, the factories became more and more numerous until the factory system had almost completely replaced the home system of manufacture.

In some cases the change from home to factory may have been beneficial to the workers but more often it led to terrible suffering and degradation.

As a rule the factories wanted unskilled labour. Children and women were preferred because they were cheaper and easier to manage. Many children under fourteen worked as many as sixteen hours a day. Poor houses frequently relieved themselves of the responsibility of caring for orphans by handing them over to factory owners. To prevent them from running away many such children were chained to their machines. In angry protest an English poet—Elizabeth Barrett Browning wrote :

“For oh”, say the children ; we are weary,
And we cannot run or leap ;

.....
For all day we drag on burden tiring.

Through the coal-dark underground ;
Or all day, we drive the wheels of iron.
In the factories round and round.

Another writer described the lot of the young employees, "The children lived the life of a machine while working and at other times that of a beast."

Small wages, long hours and child labour was bad enough in themselves, but worse than these was the haunting peril of unemployment. When factories shut down for a time the employers discharged the workers and they lived on the ragged edge of starvation, if they were lucky not to slip over the edge.

City Slums

Another unfortunate result of the factory system was the growth of unhealthy and squalid slums around the factories. The early factories provided no housing and as such the workers lived in miserable little houses. Many a dark cellar served as home for an entire family. Fever and disease played havoc with the people.

Immorality

Such unhealthy conditions were not conducive to morality and home life. Modesty and virtue were hard to maintain when families lived herded together like cattle. Both men and women took to drinking. Children imitated the grown ups and picked up their views. What family life could have been is best left to one's imagination where ignorance, poverty, hunger, dirt and disease ruled the roost.

A marked change in the countryside was one of the most important transformation caused by the industrial revolution. Before the establishment of factories, most of the people lived either in the country or in small towns spread over the countryside. With the construction of Factories, cities sprang up as if by magic. In place of quiet little villages, there were sites where chimneys emitted smoke and the streets were lined with miserable cottages. There were however other areas where

were fine large houses—where the rich and the fortunate who had large profits from the changed conditions lived.

Division of Society

The industrial revolution divided society into two distinct groups—the rich middle class (bourgeoisie comprising of manufacturers, merchants, bankers and professional men on the one hand and the wage earning (proletariat consisting of mill and factory workers on the other). The gap between employer and employees gave rise to many of our present day economic and social problems.

Evils and Benefits of factory system

All the results of the factory system were not beneficial. The differences between capital and labour resulted in two hostile groups. Unlike the Middle Ages where the employee had much in common, the line was sharply drawn between the two. The employers reaped huge profits while the workers toiled for long hours at low wages. They had divergent interests which were irreconcilable. Women and children worked in factories under the most dreadful conditions and their poverty compelled them to live in crowded and miserable houses where basic amenities were totally lacking. Morality was out of the question. In the nineteenth century at least one tenth of Manchester's population lived in cellars in appalling conditions. Food prices rose to prohibitive level and the poor were underfed and under-nourished.

There is also the other side of the picture. While a majority of the people suffered, others benefited. It is obvious that none would like to go back to live in a medieval manner with its many limitations. Much of what we cherish today are in reality the achievements of the capitalistic system. The increase in wealth has made it possible the realisation of comforts and conveniences without which we would suffer immensely. The rise of the new industrial class exercised tremendous pressure on the old aristocracy and eventually ushered in democracy. Labour unions were formed to demand better wages and more facilities. Capitalism provided an intellectual impetus. The

schools, colleges, newspapers and periodicals and libraries have all been dependent for their rapid development on the capitalistic system.

To conclude, the Industrial Revolution began in England but it was not confined there. It spread to other countries as well. They also developed their industries because inventive genius is not the monopoly of one nation. The knowledge of the Industrial methods spread to other parts of the world and other nations also made their contribution to it. The Industrial Revolution spread until most of the earth knew and experienced in their daily lives the fruits of that great upheaval, probably the greatest revolution the world has ever known. In fact the industrial revolution in the latter half of the eighteenth century had ushered in a new world. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries have developed and improved upon these inventions and discoveries. Now mankind without a shadow of doubt has a more comfortable and in many respects fuller and richer life.

4

Development of Capitalism

Capitalism, a distinctive characteristic of the modern economic order was the outgrowth of the Commercial Revolution. Capitalism, in general way, is large scale business organisation by an individual or a group of individuals with wealth enough to acquire raw materials and tools and to have labour in order to produce more commodities for profit. Profit is a basic consideration in capitalism and the status of an individual in society is measured primarily by his wealth. Evaluation of goods and services is based upon supply and demand rather than on intrinsic worth. The capitalistic system makes necessary the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few in order to promote large industrial enterprises. It makes it essential, the establishment of a banking system, to take care of credit and to facilitate the flow of capital.

New Features

Several important changes in business procedures came with the Commercial Revolution. Business ceased to be entirely personal, the capital and assets of a business unit and that of an individual enterprise were quite different things. The workers became cogs in a large machine, interested in their salary and shorter hours of work. The wage earner who merely tended some machinery, moving a lever here and there, or

tying broken threads or performing other simple and monotonous operations was reduced to insignificance. The capitalist, who provided factory, machines and material and supervised the whole business, was all important and powerful.

Banking

Banking was necessary in connection with industrial development on a large scale. It was certainly not an innovation for it had been practised in a limited way by Jewish and Syrian money changers long before the 16th Century. Banking on a very limited scale was practised in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. The Medici Family in Florence established the first great banking system in the 16th century. The Fugger family of Augsburg, Germany built another great financial organisation. Banking institutions were soon established in England, Spain, Holland, Austria and Sweden.

The numerous risks and frequent disasters that the merchants experienced in handling valuable commodities led to the adoption of insurance. The first company of this kind was established in Paris in 1776. The famous House or Lloyds in London began to write marine insurance in 1720. The Insurance Company of North America was founded in Philadelphia in 1796. Stock Exchanges made their appearance along with the increase in trade and investments. Speculation was an inevitable consequence. Investors were decided by means of false information about the South Sea Bubble and stock in the company reached dollars 5000 a share. The collapse caused such a scandal that the English government took charge of the liquidation.

The Class of Industrial Capitalists

The new Industrial capitalists came from various classes. Some had formerly been well to do farmers, others had made money in commerce, others were aristocratic landlords, a few were former working men who had gained wealth through industriousness, thrift, shrewdness, ability or good luck. Some of these amassed enormous fortunes, received titles of nobility and forced their way into the highest social circles through marriages. Others remained untitled but ambitious.

The rise of capitalism affected politics as well as society. With their wealth, their economic power, their intelligence and aggressiveness the bourgeoisie exerted more and more influence in politics as decade succeeded decade in the 19th century until the governments became practically a sort of partnership of bourgeoisie and aristocracy.

From the very beginning people have had different attitudes towards capitalism. One group has asserted that every body would be better off if governments kept their hands off business. This attitude is based on Adam Smith's *laissez faire* theory. A second group believed that capitalism is the best economic system but that attempts should be made to regulate it. The third group has been so hostile towards capitalism that they want another economic system, socialism, substituted for it.

In general, during the nineteenth century Europe, industrialized nations followed *laissez faire* policies. Many self-reliant businessmen made great fortunes. In general the standard of living in the industrialized nations of England, France and Germany rose.

Opposition of Industrial Capitalists

The rising class of industrial capitalists had little use for mercantilist doctrines and regulations which the statesmen of the seventeenth to eighteenth century had upheld. Mercantilism placed legal restrictions on trade and regulating industry by laws. In the eyes of businessmen such interference in business affairs was unwarranted and intolerable. If the government desired to promote prosperity, they argued it should let each capitalist run his own business, introduce new methods of manufacture, buy raw materials where they were cheapest, hire labourers at low wages and sell his manufactures wherever they would fetch the highest price.

Opposition of Capitalists strengthened by "Political Economists"

It was in France rather than in England that the first assault on mercantilism was delivered. Quesnay, who was a

physician employed at the Court of Louis XV conceived the idea that the circulation of wealth within a nation like the circulation of blood in a human body, must take place according to certain natural laws which could be studied as scientifically as the laws of Physiology or medicine. Quesnay and his followers are known as physiocrats because they taught a peculiar system of economics known as "the rule of nature." Any interference with the right of private property and economic liberty would be contrary to the "natural laws" which they claimed to have discovered. The new doctrine was summed up in the celebrated French phrase *laissez-faire et laissez passer* ("let things be done and let things pass" or simply "let things alone").

Adam Smith

These ideas were carried over into Great Britain by Adam Smith from France. While on a visit to France Smith became acquainted with the physiocratic economists and their doctrines. After returning to Scotland, he wrote a book which probably had a great effect on nineteenth century history than any of Napoleon's battles. It was entitled "An enquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations". Adam Smith was not a mere imitator of the physiocrats. He modified some of their theories, rejected others and added more of his own. He also asserted that prosperity could best be promoted by giving businessmen liberty and by establishing free trade. Laws restricting trade and industry only served to hamper the production of wealth instead of enriching a nation. Custom duties on grain and other foodstuffs was a curse. Mercantilism should be abolished.

Other British Economists

Malthus and Ricardo followed in the footsteps of Adam Smith and added still other arguments against governmental interference in business.

Rise of Economic Liberty

The combination of business interests with economic theories was irresistible. Assailed from both sides, mercantilism

weakened and lost its grip on industry and trade. Economic liberty was the new order of things in Europe. This Revolution had three important results. (1) It implied that the old mercantilist laws regulating industry were abandoned and the industrial capitalists were allowed to manufacture what they pleased, to employ as many workers as they pleased, at whatever wages they pleased. In other words, the collapse of mercantilism allowed the capitalist to become an autocratic sovereign over his factory.

(2) Likewise, the mercantilist restrictions on foreign trade were dropped, custom duties on grain replaced, the protective tariff abolished and free trade established. This was made possible gradually between 1820 and 1860.

(3) And finally, the mercantilist belief in the value of colonies was scoffed at by the new advocates of economic liberty.

Freedom and Power of the Capitalists

As all restrictions on wages, hours of work, age of employees so and forth were abandoned, the employers often abused their power. Working people, rather than starve, were willing to work under conditions that were injurious to them and the society as a whole.

One wonders why people were willing to allow such inhumane conditions to exist. Had there been strong guilds or labour unions in the European countries, the situation might have been different. In union there is strength. The old guilds had disappeared and there was nothing to take their place. Workers were not permitted to form unions. Helpless and isolated the workmen sometimes formed secret societies and sometimes in desperation burnt factories and broke machinery. Things improved when democracy and trade unionism developed rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century.

England

The sources available for the estimation of capital accumulation for the period 1760-1860 are not adequate to construct moderately respectable estimates for certain import-

ant sectors like manufacturing and hence for the economy as a whole. At best the figures are indicative of the extent of capital expenditures on fixed assets and inventories, at home and abroad and of the corresponding growth of the stock of capital.

In 1765 Sidney Pollard presented a paper in which for the first time an effort was made to construct estimates of gross capital formation for the period 1770-1835. The gross domestic fixed capital formation which was 22 million pounds in 1770 had risen to 31 million pounds in 1835 while stock building had risen from 1.5 million in 1770 to 2.5 million pounds in 1835. Similarly there was an increase in foreign investment and bullion from 0.7 million to 6.5 million for the same period.

The gross stock of domestic reproducible fixed capital on social dwellings, public works and buildings, agriculture (which included farm holdings, improvements and equipments), industry and commerce (industrial and commercial buildings, industrial machinery and equipment, mining and quarrying, gas and water) had risen from 36 million pounds in 1760 to 105 million in 1800, 277 million in 1830 and 697 million pounds in 1860. In so far as transport was concerned and this included, railways, roads and bridges, carriages and coaches, canals and water-ways, docks and harbours and ships, it was £ 38 million in 1760, £ 81 million in 1800, £ 139 million in 1830 and £ 504 million in 1860.

Thus it is clear that the gross stock of domestic reproducible fixed capital in Great Britain had been steadily rising and had gone up from a mere £ 490 million in 1770 to £ 2310 million in 1860 for the above listed assets.

In so far as agriculture was concerned the important component of domestic capital accumulation covered all capital outlays both by land owners and tenants on farm buildings, on enclosures, reclamation, drainage and other improvements to the land, on farm roads and on carts, equipment and machinery. In 1860 it stood at £ 430 million.

Turning to manufactures, the estimated figure is £ 98 million for industries other than textiles and £ 156 million for

manufacturing as a whole. Allowance has also to be made for equipment used in building and contracting and one might add £ 4 million, raising the total gross stock in manufacturing and building to £ 160 million in 1861.

The stock of circulating capital, overseas assets, coin and bullion and land was £ 960 million in 1700, £ 1040 million in 1800, £ 1180 million in 1830 and £ 1,420 million in 1860.

The above figures give us an idea of the process of economic growth of British economy from the pre-industrial condition of 1760 through the industrial revolution and transformation of agriculture and transport to the industrialised and urbanised society of 1860.

The major feature of the economic development is the decline in the relative importance of land and of circulating capital and its share of the national wealth from about 60 per cent, in 1760 to 30 per cent in 1860. Circulating capital in agriculture, industry and trade also grew quite slowly. What gained importance are fixed capital and overseas assets, the former's share of the national wealth rose from 30 per cent to 50 per cent and the latter's share rises from nothing to 10 per cent.

Organisation in England

The laws restricting labour combinations were not in conformity with the spirit of liberalism which had gained so much headway in England in the nineteenth century. Among the most blatant pieces of close legislation designed to weaken the bargaining power of labour were the Combination Acts of 1799 and 1800, the repeal of the Justices power to fix wages in 1813 and the apprentices clauses in 1814 and the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Though the Combination Acts were repealed in 1825 keeping in view the general abolition of various restrictions in conformity with the philosophic tendencies yet the New Poor Law placed in the hands of wealth a perfectly despotic power over the labour people—the law deprived the poor of the point of resistance which by enabling the labourer to make terms, imposed a restraint upon employees—. “The New Poor Law had placed a screw in the hands of masters against which it is impossible for the work-

man—you must accept such wages as I choose to give ; for if you dare to refuse them however inadequate or disproportionate to the value of your labour the New Poor Law has enacted that you shall starve.”

It is difficult to disagree with the statements made by the *Standard* and the *Morning Herald* respectively. The Poor Law of 1834 in fact came nearer than any other Act of Parliament in the nineteenth century to provoking a civil war in Great Britain.

The repeal of the Combinations Act in 1825 and the Factory Act of 1833 were the first important steps in favour of labour's bargaining position. “Behind these concessions was the unreasoning fear of rebellion the part of the new ruling class of England (the large manufacturers) those whom late events have made the great men of England” as Edward Gibbar Wakefield wrote in 1833. The measures of 1825 and 1833 reflected, above all, the beginning of the new response of labour adopting itself to new conditions by trade union association and by political pressure, in order to bend the wage bargain back in its favour. Collective bargaining was now acknowledged as legal. More restrictions were removed in 1871 and 1875.

France

Of all the countries that experienced industrialisation, France was one of the few to experience an early and lasting break in development.

Francois Perroux wrote that “about 1860 there appeared the first signs of a slowing down of the economy ; from 1880 this became a pronounced trend”. The rate of growth fell and the second phase of industrialisation (1892-1914) was “much less vigorous than the first”. The level of capital formation in France during the third quarter of the nineteenth century declined. Dupior's finding showed that the growth rate of capital investment during 1878-1903 was 0.91 per cent per annum, as against 1.71 percent and 1.34 per cent in the preceeding and subsequent periods. It is thus obvious that there was a halt in investment. The savings stagnated at 2,200 million Francs per annum in 1853-78 and 2,040 million Francs in

1978-1903. It was during 1903-1914 that annual average was 3,500 million francs at a time when private income totalled 32,000 million francs. This hindered the progress of the economy beginning in 1860 or 1880. It was accentuated by the shortage or the poor distribution of the nation's savings. Internal investment was stable for the greater part of the nineteenth century and after 1880 mainly due to a great depression, it suffered from the consequences of a worsening economic situation. The annual rate of growth of capital assets fell from an average of 20 per cent between 1820-1874 to 12 per cent between 1874 and 1938.

Public works attracted investment during the period 1820-40, railway construction in the period 1840-60, urban development in 1860-1880, public works projects accounted for 71 per cent of fixed investment before 1880 and accounted for 54 per cent during 1880-1913.

In the 1860's the construction industry employed one-fifth of the industrial labour force and its output was a quarter of the value added by all industrial firms. The building industry was an independent source of income for a large fraction of the work force and was a potential spur for growth. The building industry as an element was lacking in the economy after 1880. It had become more vulnerable and because it was unable to meet the deflationary measures of the time it appears it aggravated the depression of the 1930's.

The Railways and the transport in general, because of the volume of capital investment, could have played a role comparable to that of the building industry in the economy of France. The capital involved was considerable. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was one fifth and from 1840 one half of all property investment. The major part was guaranteed by public authorities. The growth rate of investment of the Railways in the nineteenth century was 5.35 per cent per annum as against 1.22 per cent for investment in conventional means of transport.

There were two major causes of development in the public works sector. The first which lasted throughout was linked to the development of the transport system and the other factor

merged from the rapid wear and tear of materials and from technical change.

French industrialisation had continued to be dependent on agricultural prosperity and on investments related to the basic sector. The first two-thirds of the nineteenth century witnessed the first dynamic element in the history of capital formation in France namely investment in the basic sector and during this period industrial investment merely followed suit. During the closing years of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century investment in the basic sector which was depressed since 1880 finally recovered under the stimulus of industrial investment. New innovations like the motor car played a vital role in stimulating new industries to undertake new methods of production.

The process of industrial capital formation was very different from the formation of capital in the various communication networks. The former was always dependent on investment of a personal character whereas the latter was financed mainly by the issue of debentures, guaranteed by the state.

Organisation in France

Labour Organisation in France was slower and more irregular than in England or Germany. Labour combinations were forbidden by Napoleon. There was no marked relaxation until after the revolution of 1830. Napoleon III (1851) revived the labour legislation of Napoleon Bonaparte and it was not until 1864 that combinations of workmen were legalised. The confederation Generale du travail (the General Confederation of Labour 1895) one of the largest and most influential labour organisation in the world was organised at Limoges. It excluded politics and its sole object was the unification of workingmen in the economic domain and in their struggle for their emancipation.

Japan

No country in the history of the world has risen to international prominence as quickly as Japan. The economic transformation of Japan has been the most celebrated aspect of her modern history. Japanese economy developed during the

Meiji era roughly from the 1860's until the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese war.

Japan it appears had been existing with a relatively backward economy during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and a large part of the nineteenth century as well. The overwhelming majority of the people were peasants and their agricultural methods were traditional and their production well below the expected standards. Very little capital equipment was used by the farmers and scientific practices such as seed selection were unknown. Significant mechanical improvements did not come into existence till after the Second World War. With a peasant population of 70 to 75% burdened with state taxation the level of per capita income was comparatively low.

6000 Even in the non-agricultural sectors the Japanese economy resembled that of the agricultural. Machinery was not in use except under unusual circumstances. Productivity was dependent on the skills of the individual workers. Fixed capital was a minor factor in the production function.

The Tokogawa regime, for reasons best known to them, had enforced a policy of isolation—a policy which remained in force for nearly two hundred years and was finally abandoned in the 1860's. This short sighted policy had deprived Japan of advanced technology and what was being utilised was only second best technology and organisation. However, what is significant is that in spite of being deprived of scientific advantage and modern technology, Japan was a vigorous and effective traditional society and even then more advanced than many African and Latin American countries of today.

The Meiji Restoration in 1868 was an epoch making event in Japanese history and Japanese modernisation in all spheres—economic, political and social began with the restoration of Emperor Meiji. The thirty years history dating from 1868 can broadly be classified into two categories—the first (1868-1885) the period of transition and the second the beginning of modern economic growth during the 1880's and continuing till the turn of the century.

153.94
SAT

During the period of transition Japanese economy experienced ups and draws. Till 1876 the position remained relatively calm followed by severe inflation which lasted till 1881 and then intense deflation which ended in 1885. The inflation which was beneficial to none others but the framers threatened the stability of the new leadership. It took the Finance Minister Matsukata considerable time to restore economic order.

The growth of modern Japan began after 1885. By 1901 the factory output contributed about 10 per cent of net national production and the gross domestic capital formation was 10 per cent of the GNP.

Meiji Japan had begun to industrialize itself and this early and limited industrialisation was based on specific pattern of capital formation *viz.*

(a) Public investment generally exceeded the level of private productive investment.

(b) Investment in construction outweighed investment in producers durable equipment.

(c) The investments revealed traditional techniques and did not incorporate imported technological progress.

Items with high capital output ratios like road building, port improvement, government buildings, accounted for two thirds of public capital formation. The most significant aspect of the Meiji investment pattern was that capital goods were produced by traditional as well as modern methods. It is interesting to note that in Meiji Japan roughly one half of the capital goods were produced by traditional methods. This is an outstanding feature of early Japanese industrialisation. Initially modern economic growth of Japan was largely based on the achievements of a traditional economy. The pattern of capital formation in Japan since the 1870's had been remarkably stable. This consisted of periods of rapid growth rate and growth of capital formation followed by a number of years of lower growth. The first investment growth was inevitably due to the rapid increase of investments in private industries which included vital industries like transport, communications and public utility services. At the beginning of the twentieth century, total non-agricultural private capital

formation in constant prices totalled about 200 million yen per annum. By the end of the first world war it had gone upto 600 million yen per annum. The level of investment had risen by 400 million yen out of which 350 million yen were accounted for by facilitating industries. By the end of the decade (1930-40), private capital formation totalled about 1,800 million yen. This amount was generated by the manufacturing and facilitating industries, the former having a slight edge over the latter.

As earlier stated the first period of industrialisation from the Restoration to 1880 was a period of preparation for modern economic growth. This was the period of industrial pioneers whose limited capital and determination laid the foundations of rapid growth. During this phase, sugar and textile mills, a paper company and the Tokyo Electric Light Company came into existence. In 1876 the House of Mitsui established its own bank and then in 1882 the Bank of Japan came into existence. The second period from 1885 to 1914 saw the creation of strong industrial empires by the large merchant houses who controlled industrial plants and mines.

To sum up private investment together with new and largely imported technology was mainly responsible for Japan's economic modernisation and the level of private investment which is always determined by profit expectations had continuously increased, thanks to the returns that industrialists obtained for their investments.

Germany

Capital formation in 19th century Germany was the result of its rapid and far reaching economic transformation. According to W.W. Rostov there were three periods in this development.

(1) The period 1800-50 when the necessary ground was prepared, (2) 1850-73 when it arrived at the take off stage and (3) 1873-1913 which characterised by a growth in the entire economy.

It must be remembered that between 1800 and 1820 about 70 per cent of Germany's population was dependent on agri-

culture. During this period additional land, labour and capital became available to the agricultural sector. The rise in agricultural income during the period (1800-1850) helped the Prussian industry to grow and expand. Germany, faced a competition from Britain even in its own markets.

Investment in agriculture dominated capital formation in Germany during the nineteenth century. The capital stock in agriculture in 1913 was nearly one-fifth of the total economy. This capital formation included investment in buildings, in live-stock, in land clearing and improvement and other items like seed, fertilizer, farm implements and machinery. If the necessary figures for the period are an indication it is obvious that agriculture was generating a surplus.

Coming to the second half of the nineteenth century the growth in investments roughly kept pace with agriculture. Fluctuations in agricultural investment took place during this period and this was due to the fluctuations in stocks and harvests. Agriculture continued to be vulnerable in spite of considerable capital accumulation and technological progress during the period under review. There was during this time comparatively lesser investment in machinery until around 1900 and considerable investment in buildings and live-stock. Throughout the nineteenth century, in Germany, building took the lions share of resources leading to capital formation. According to Knut Borchardt "urban building was a leading sector in Germany's industrialisation, stimulating not only the construction industry but also the building materials industry, the glass industry, the wood industry, the gas and water works and from 1880 on, in addition, the electricity works and urban tramways. Without urban construction, the modern industries based on coal and steam could not have developed."

One of the best known indicators of industrialisation has always been the growth in the stock of industrial capital and for nineteenth century Germany this was particularly true. According to Hoffmann, business investment grew from an annual rate of 120-30 million marks in the 1850's to over two billion marks in 1900. This indicates that the focus during the period 1850-1900 was industrial investment.

The Prussian economy, the most important of German economies, was clearly generating a surplus and converting it into real capital on a fairly large scale during the first half of the nineteenth century whereas the level of investment in Prussia at 1913 prices increased by about 51% between 1816-22 and 1840-49, in Germany as a whole between 1851-60 and 1881-90 it grew by more than 200 per cent. This was real self sustaining growth.

The main element of capital accumulation in Prussia before 1850 was obviously agricultural investment and this included investment in buildings. In spite of ups and downs the capital requirement of agriculture remained high during the period 1850-1913.

The principal real form of capital accumulation was building investment (including agricultural buildings). This remained true throughout the nineteenth century, although by 1900 the share of machinery and equipment had increased considerably as compared to that of buildings.

Investment in social overhaul capital (which includes expenditure on transportation, communication, health, education and scientific research facilities) became important in the 1830's and the 1840's. This form of capital accumulation it may be noted, continued to be very important in Germany till 1913 especially in the light of German industrialisation.

Industrial investment grew rather slowly in the first half of the nineteenth century. Even in the 1840's the net industrial capital formation was less than 5 per cent of the aggregate total. This changed completely after the 1850's and began growing at a rate much higher than the overall average.

Trade Unions

A number of national associations were established after the industrial code of the North German Federation legalised trade unions in 1869. The total membership of these unions stood at 332,000 in 1895 and rose to one million in 1900 and 3 million in 1914 and by 1922 it had 9.2 million on its rolls which constituted nearly 50% of the non-agricultural labour force. Trade unions advocated the principle of collective

bargaining, which was a national consequence of large organisations. However it took some time and adjustment on the part of the industrialists to look upon unions as equal bargaining partners. Labour leaders for years continued to face a hostile government. Anti-socialist laws were on the statute book until 1890. By 1914, in spite of the hostile opposition of larger employers, collective bargaining achieved a positive role in labour-employer relations by 1914.

The unions achieved success in obtaining concessions on hours of work and working conditions rather than in influencing wage levels. The unions also exercised a deterrent influence on certain extremists among employers, by persuading them not to take aggressive action during the period of slump and they also succeeded in reducing the number of strikes. The institutionalisation of labour relations resulted in integrating workers into an industrial society. They developed a work ethos and taught their members the norms of bourgeois respectability and responsibility.

There were in Germany employers and industrialists who resisted labour groups and attempted to boycott the unions by refusing to give trade unionists employment. The struggle was still going on when the war broke out in 1914.

5

Imperialism

The defeat of Napoleon in 1815, ended some four hundred years of European imperialism. This however resulted in the European expansion in other parts of the world and involved in varying proportions trading, missionary activities, adventure, loot and plunder, conquests and of course inevitably wars between rival powers.

This process of expansion however suffered a temporary set back in the past Napoleonic period between 1815-1870, only to be renewed with greater vigour towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

What is interesting is that by 1820, various European countries had lost their colonial possessions. France lost her territories in America and the East, Spain lost her vast South American possessions. Prior to this the thirteen American colonies had broken away from Great Britain and by 1822 Portugal had lost Brazil.

No tears were shed at the loss of these colonial possessions. On the contrary various persons welcomed the turn, events had taken. Adam Smith, the celebrated economist, agreed that the burdens of colonialism outweighed its alleged advantages, Bentham the English philosopher and jurist had urged the French to emancipate her colonies, Cobden the English statesman strongly advocated free trade and the abolition of commercial privileges. Gladstone, the historical British Prime

Minister anticipated the dissolution of the British empire in the ultimate analysis and in 1852, Disraeli (who later also became Prime Minister of England) emphatically stated, "These wretched colonies will all be independent in a few years and are millstones around our necks". Even Bismarck, the Chancellor of Germany, asserted in 1868 that "All the advantages claimed from the mother country are for the most part illusory and added that England is abandoning her colonial policy. She finds its too costly".

The period of anti-colonialism, however soon came to an end and from 1870 public opinion in all European countries led to mad race for colonial possessions and the times after 1870 came to be termed as the "Age of Imperialism". The modern concept of Imperialism was singularly marked by its dramatic reappearance and pre-eminence in the polity of European powers during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Imperialism

The word imperialism comes from the Latin word "Imperium", which connotes power. Powerful industrialized nations tried to gain control over the governments of certain backward areas for exploiting them. According to Hayes, "The desire and policy of civilized nations to rule over the weak and backward people is called Imperialism". Charles A. Beard asserts that "Imperialism is employment of the energies of government and diplomacy to acquire territories, protectorates and spheres of influence, occupied usually by other races or peoples and to promote industrial trade and investment opportunities". The history of Asia and Africa reveals that imperialism was a very important factor in the history of the century before the outbreak of the First World War (1914).

Most of the European powers were infected by this fever to possess colonies. Great Britain and Russia further increased their big empires. France created an empire in Indo-China and Africa while Germany occupied parts of Africa and islands in the Pacific apart from a sphere of influence in China. Italy, Portugal, Spain and Belgium occupied terri-

torries in Africa. Holland had already taken possession of the East Indies. Japan taking a cue from the nations of Europe expanded by capturing Formosa and Korea and cast longing eyes on possible areas it could acquire. Thus by the time the first world war broke out Africa, Asia and the East Indies had been either brought under control or were earmarked for annexation.

The countries of Latin America escaped because of the United States of America which refused to allow the conquest of any territory in the New World by the European powers of the old world. The consequence was that these states developed in their own way.

Reasons for Imperialism

1. As countries became more industrialized, many businessmen were anxious that their countries should obtain control of colonies to get raw materials and markets for their surplus goods and to invest in underdeveloped areas. The economic motive was perhaps the strongest motive for imperialism.

2. Nationalism was another reason for the growth of the new imperialism. It was the desire of patriots to have their nations possess additional territory, Germany and Italy worked to increase their power. France hoped to revive its glory. Great Britain desired to hold on to what it had and to expand its possessions. Others wanted colonies for military and navel bases. In short it was to win glory and prestige in the world. The nations of Europe began to measure their greatness by the extent of the empire overseas that they possessed. Every country of Europe became keen to achieve the status of the world power.

3. As population increased nationalists feared that many of their people would migrate to other countries. They wanted colonies to which they could send their surplus population.

4. There were others who supported the new imperialism as a means of spreading Christianity. In fact much spade work was done by the missionaries who have been called the right arm of the imperialists.

5. Many believed that imperialism was a means by which the peoples in the backward areas would be able to enjoy the benefits of education, sanitation and other comforts of life. These people felt that there was a superior civilisation and that they had a divine mission to spread their superior culture in backward areas. The British poet, Rudyard Kipling went to the extent of calling it the, white man's burden."

Means Employed to Obtain Colonies

1. People in the undeveloped areas could not defend themselves against the modern imperialists equipped as they were with bullets and bombs.

2. Another method employed by the imperialists was by drugging people with alcohol, opium or cocaine. Thus they increased their hold over the backward colonial people.

3. Not only this, at times, it happened that unwittingly and unknowingly, chiefs gave up and surrendered vast areas for mere trifles.

4. Another age old technique employed by the imperialists was to *divide and rule*. Religious differences were encouraged together with castes or divergent political shades were played one against the other. The main objective was to prevent the subject peoples from combining against the Empire.

5. Further the Imperialist Nations formed alliances one with another to acquire colonies from each other.

6. To expand their influence the imperialist nations always tried to control important water routes. Britishers got hold of the Suez Canal, the Russians of Dardanelles so as to be able to have access to the Mediterranean. The American control of the Panama Canal helped to make the Carribean Sea an American Lake.

Types of Control

1. Various types of control have been exercised by imperialists over conquered people. Sometimes it was outright annexation and thus the territory became a *colony*.

2. At other times the native ruler or rulers were allowed to remain as puppet heads without powers or influence. Such a domination resulted in the creation of PROTECTORATE.

3. Another device employed was to obtain permission for building of railroads or developing mines or a plantation. These privileges were termed *concessions*.

4. Lastly, if the imperialistic power obtained a political or economic monopoly over a territory that was backward, it came to be described as a *sphere of influence*.

Imperialism Strikes the Far East

The popularity of Chinese goods in Europe and America virtually necessitated the opening up of China. The West wanted ivory fans, lacquered boxes, porcelain vases, the tea and silks of China. What was needed was an excuse. This was provided by the Chinese Emperors order to stop all smuggling of opium into China which was having a detrimental influence on the people. The Britishers declared war on China. This is known as the First Opium War (1839-42). It proved expensive for China in that it lost Hong Kong to the Britishers, conceded the right to England to sell opium as well as to open four more ports to European trade. China which had remained completely shut off since 1717 was forced open. As a result of the Second Opium War (1856-1860) more territories were thrown open and Christianity was forced upon them. The basic difference was that in the Second War France had joined hands with Britain to force the Chinese to grant concessions. Soon the other nations began competing with France and Britain for special privileges in China. Even the Americans joined the bandwagon. As one Chinese author asserts the European nations began to "lacerate China like Tigers" by seizing Chinese provinces.

Long before this new wave imperialism began to extend its fangs, the East Indies had become a part of the Dutch Empire. India, Ceylon, the Malaya States, Australia and New Zealand besides other areas had become a part of the British Empire. After 1870 France annexed Indo-China, the British Burma, the Japanese Formosa and Korea. The Russians penetrated into Manchuria and the Germans into Shantung. In 1898 the United States acquired the Hawai islands and followed it up by taking over Philippines together with Guam and some other Samoan Islands in 1899.

Imperialism and Africa

Africa continued to be a "Dark Continent" for so little was known about it inspite of the fact that by 1871 France had acquired Algeria in the North and Britain the Cape Colony in the South. It was David Livingstone who in 1880 plunged into Central Africa to explore and unintentionally helped to make the African continent a happy hunting ground for the Imperialists of Europe after 1871. One of the *cruelties* that had been perpetrated on the people of Africa was the slave trade which Livingstone had described as "an open running sore". But who cared for his comments. There was easy money and an abundant supply of cheap labour.

The Scramble for Africa

By the word 'scramble' we generally mean "a dash of struggle for what can be had"—"eager and unceremonious struggle or competition for something".

Laying so close to Europe—almost within sight—the continent of Africa escaped the lust of European greed for colonialism till past the middle of the nineteenth century. Africa was till then for all practical purposes a *terra incognita* (an unknown country)¹. It is one of the most remarkable circumstances in history that so accessible a continent remained so long unexplored.

Reasons why Africa was little known to Europe upto the middle of the nineteenth century : The reasons why Africa, though so close to Europe, remained so long little known up to the middle of the nineteenth century were largely physical. The coasts of the 'Dark Continent' are the most inhospitable for its interior is a plateau shut off almost everywhere by belts of desert land or swampy malarious regions along the coast. Even the rivers do not form convenient highways into the interior, because they are mostly innavigable for any distance from their mouths, on account of falls or rapids and

1. Till past the middle of the nineteenth century, Africa was almost no man's land. Apart from the British colony in the extreme south, and the more recently acquired French colony in Algeria (1830), the European nations were represented by a few decaying remnants of history of Portuguese and Spanish imperialism.

the maze of tropical forest. Moreover, trade with Africa was not considered profitable to its inhabitants who, backward as they were, had few wants.

Factors which drew Europeans to Africa : Yet a number of factors foreshadowed a change in European contact with “this dark, despised Continent. Egypt, because of its strategic importance, drew the attention of the European powers to that ancient seat of civilization. Other factors were : In 1807 was abolished slave trade in Britain. Her subsequent crusade for its universal abolition stimulated an increased interest in Africa. Missionaries were fired with zeal to carry the war against slave-trade even in the darkest recesses of the Continent and to reclaim the negroes for christianity. Then European nations being debarred from South America by the Monroe doctrine turned their attention to Africa particularly for those tropical products for which a great demand had been created by the Industrial Revolution.

The Opening up of Africa

The myth of the Dark Continent began to be lifted with the exploration of its interior by individuals. A number of such explorers penetrated into the country in the middle of the nineteenth century. New vistas of geographical discoveries were opened. Spoke and Sir Samuel Baker took great pains in discovering the sources of the river Nile. But the greatest work in the field of exploration was done by David Livingstone a Scottish missionary (1813-1873) and Henry Morton Stanley (1841-1908)². The former between 1852 and 1873 explored the Great Central Plateau. During his last expedition lack of news caused universal anxiety for his safety, and in 1869 Gordon Bennett of the *New York Herald* commissioned a correspondent of that newspaper, Stanley, in a terse telegram, to find Livingstone.

2. John Rowlands, a poor Welsh boy of 13 had emigrated to U.S.A in 1854 and had been befriended by a merchant of New Orleans named Stanley, whose name he assumed. Young Stanley became a journalist,

On a relief expedition to find Livingstone, Stanley left Zanzibar at the end of March, 1871, and on November 10th, he found the hero on the banks of Lake Tanganyika greeting him with the words, "Mr. Livingstone, I believe. My name is Stanley". Livingstone died in 1873 after having focussed the attention of the people of Europe on Africa. Stanley now vowed himself to the continuation of Livingstone's work of exploring equatorial Africa. An expedition was equipped at the joint expense of the London "Daily Telegraph" and the "New York Herald". Stanley left Bagamoye, opposite Zanzibar, in November, 1874, explored Lakes Victoria and Nyanza, and then examined Tanganyika. Provoked by hearsay reports of the Arab slavers, he determined to attempt the solution of the problem of the Central African rivers. Following a stream, which he hoped might junction with the Congo—as it did, for it was the Lualaba—he arrived after ten months at the mouth of the Congo. His dark hair had turned white. He had left all his white companions and two-thirds of his native carriers behind him in that lethal region. Stanley had opened the Congo basin. In this way, Africa once a "Dark Continent" stood known to Europe with its system of rivers, lakes and valleys—thanks to the explorers. Livingstone and Stanley, together helped to *unlock* the mystery that was the African continent. And then started the mad rush to Africa of missionaries, explorers and traders. In fact Stanley provided the necessary impetus for imperialists. In one of his speeches he said: I have passed through a land—which knows no owners. A word to the wise is sufficient. You have clothes and hardware and glassware and gun powder there millions of natives have ivory, and gums and rubber and dyestuffs and in barter there is good profit".

The achievements of Livingstone and Stanley evoked the unstinted admiration throughout Europe and America but they also revealed to the governments of the European nations the vast unexploited wealth of the Dark Continent of which the coast only had been touched during the past four centuries. One of the first to realize the commercial possibilities of "this vast treasure-house" of raw materials was King

Leopold II of Belgium, a man who was greatly interested in the exploration of Africa.

The International Association for the exploration and civilization of Africa : In September 1876, Leopold called a conference of the powers “to discuss the question of the exploration, and the civilization of Africa and the means of opening up the interior of the continent to the commerce, industry, and scientific enterprise of the civilized world”, and to consider measures for extinguishing “the terrible scourge of slavery known to prevail over wide and populous tracts, in the interior of the Continent.” In this conference representatives of Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia participated. As a result of its deliberations, an International African Association was established, which was to have its seat at Brussels, and whose aim was to be the exploration and civilization of Central Africa. Each nation wishing to co-operate was to collect funds for the common object.

A separate committee of the Association at Brussels developed into the “Internation Association of the Congo” (1879). Financed by Leopold and managed by Stanley, this Association established trading factories and obtained concessions from native chiefs in the Congo basin.

The Berlin Conference 1884-85

In the early eighties Britain was pre-occupied by the problems of Egypt and the Near and Far East. Moreover, the Liberal Party was opposed to the unlimited extension of national obligations, for the occupation of Egypt and the checking of the Russian aggression in the direction of India were proving costly and were producing active international implications. But the French were spurred on by the Congo enterprise, the de Brazza explored and occupied a huge area north of the Congo. The Portuguese began to revive ancient claims to the whole of this territory and a number of enterprising Germans were pioneering in Africa and advancing the claims of their country at home and abroad.

To settle these disputes, it was mooted that a conference should be held in Berlin in 1884-85 to adjust territorial claims

and define spheres of exploration in Africa. But before the conference met, the U.S.A. apparently attracted by its high sounding phrases, recognised the rights of Leopold's Congo Association in the region, and France shortly afterwards withdrew her chief objections to the status of the Association. The other governments followed suit ; and the anomalous position of the International Association of the Congo was ratified by the public law of Europe.

The Berlin Conference having assembled in November 1884, Bismark suggested that it should apply itself to the formulation of a procedure to be adopted by the European powers in the partition of the unoccupied portions of Africa, to the guarantee of free navigation of two great waterways which lay in undefined spheres of political influence, *viz.* the Congo and the Niger; and to the guarantee of freedom of trade and equality of status in the Congo region. With regard to the first, the Conference declared that any Power in annexing African territory must notify the other Powers of the fact, and that no annexation should be made of territory which was not effectively occupied. The British representative pointed out at once that a sphere of British influence had already existed in the lower Niger since 1844, that Britain would preserve freedom of navigation on the river, but would not accept international regulation. As the French had by then penetrated from Algeria, and had established right of occupation upon the Upper Niger, an Anglo-French Commission was shortly afterwards established to regulate navigation of the river, which in fact, remained open to the free competition of all nationals. In regard to the Congo, the principle of international freedom of trade was decreed, the vigorous abolition of the slave trade was called for, but the stringent control of the sale of intoxication liquor to the natives was thwarted by the opposition of Germany and Holland. France was guaranteed in the possession of a vast area of 257,000 sq. miles north of the Congo, and Portugal of an area of about 350,000 sq. miles of it, and the Congo Association of the huge hinterland of the Congo basin, comprising 900,000 sq. miles, but was to be open to the trade and commerce of all nations of Europe.

Congo Free State

The professions of the delegates to the Berlin Conference were admissible but no provision was made for their future translation into reality. Within a few months of the Conference, Leopold II had declared himself absolute sovereign of the area, which was known as the Congo Free State (April 1885), and governments of Europe at once acquiesced. Later, in 1889 Leopold declared that this property of his would pass on to Belgium after his death. Thus Leopold II had become personal proprietor of the Congo State which had an area of nearly 900,000 sq. miles and a native population of about five million. He must be held personally responsible for its terrible history³ until on November 15th 1908, it became a Belgium colony. Thus from what purported to be an international state, the Congo Free State first became the personal property of King Leopold and was then converted outright into a Belgian colony subject to Belgian Parliament.

France in Africa

Since the occupation of Algeria in 1830 (formally annexed in 1842), that region had gradually ceased to be regarded as a field of colonial exploitation, and had become almost an extension of France, with a large and growing European population, possessing its own civil rights and enjoying the prestige and protection of France. In addition to Algeria, the French had maintained since the early eighteenth century trading stations on the west coast of Africa about the Senegal and Gambia rivers. But, apart from missionary and trading interests, France had paid little attention to them until under

3. Tribal customs and the ordinary human rights of natives were cynically ignored. The territory was exploited for profit by means which furnished a grotesque commentary upon the high-sounding professions of the International Association of the Congo. Harrowing tales of almost incredible cruelties perpetrated by the Belgians shocked the conscience of even imperialistic Europe. Criticism both at home and abroad became so insistent that Leopold was compelled in 1908 to make over his personal estate to the Belgium government in return for compensation.

Napoleon III General Faidherbe was appointed governor of French West Africa with the object of extending French political influence in the hope of linking up the West African possessions with Algeria, thus establishing a great colonial empire. During the next thirty years Faidherbe despatched political missions of exploration, which occupied the upper basin of the Niger, penetrated to the shore of the Lake Chad, and in the nineties began to extend towards the Egyptian Sudan. They occupied Tunis in 1881, and about the same time asserted their claim to that vast area north of the Congo, which in the nineties they connected up with their west African territories. In 1892, they occupied Dahomey and the next year Timbuktu.

In another region during these years *viz.* Madagascar, the French pressed their ancient claims finally securing the sole control of the island at the end of 1895, much to the chagrin of Britain. At the same time their explorers and agents advanced across the Sahara, aiming at the Sudan, and hoping to connect these huge territories, with the addition of the Sudan, with their settlement at Obok in Somiland. They were checked on the lower Niger in 1897, and the Sudan at Fashoda in 1898, but, by the end of the nineteenth century the French had made good their claim to an area of more than 3,800, 000 sq. miles—one-third of Africa. In the hope of rounding off their African empire they had already begun that peaceful penetration of Morocco, which led them into the adventures of early twentieth century, and went so far as to provoke the great clash between the two opposed groups of expansive European Powers.

Portugal in Africa

Portugal did not lag behind in the scramble. She expanded her decaying coastal stations south of the Belgian Congo, and these developed into the large province of Angola. On the west coast she had also founded the colony of Mozambique or Portuguese East Africa. She tried to connect her eastern and and western possessions by securing a belt of territory right across Africa but British rivalry forced her to desist.

Italy in Africa

The story of Italian colonial expansion in Africa is short. Italian imperialism began in Africa when in 1883, Italy seized Eritrea on the Red Sea. Next followed the acquisition of Italian Somaliland on the east coast of Africa. Italy next tried to link up these possessions by the conquest of Abyssinia but was overwhelmed by the Abyssinians at Adowa in 1896. Checked there, she turned to Tripoli in the north and snatched it from Turkey in 1912, along with Cyrenaica. These two provinces became the Italian colony of Libia which afforded little real scope for genuine colonisation.

Germany in Africa

The first German colony in Africa was established in 1884, when German South West Africa was occupied. Two centuries before, Frederick William the Great Elector of Brandenburg, had obtained a concession on the Gold Coast ; but the project had collapsed early in the eighteenth century. During the nineteenth century interest in the project of colonial expansion, particularly in Africa, was revived in Germany by missionaries, traders, explorers, and politicians. In 1797, Hornemann made a great journey from Tripoli to the Niger, and shortly afterwards Heinrich Barth travelled from the same point across the Sahara to Lake Chad, visiting the mysterious city of Timbuktu. In the middle of the nineteenth century other German explorers traversed the Sudan and the basin of the upper Nile. In 1860, Baron Von der Decken surveyed, Mt. Kilimanjaro, and expressed the hope that rich territory about it would become German colony, as it did in 1885 through the efforts of Kral Peters. Others such as Mohr and Mauch explored the Zambesi region and Mashonaland—the site of that strange, lost civilization of ‘King Solomon’s Mines’ and the vast ruins of Zimbabwe. Still later, within the period which we are studying, those indefatigable travellers, Rohlfs, Nachtigal and Schweinfurth traversed the oases of the Sahara and scoured West Africa, letting great shafts of light into the Dark Continent, and educating a public opinion in Germany in its vast possibilities. These three attended Leopold’s famous

conference at Brussels in 1876, and formed a German branch in 1878. Three years later the *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft* was founded. All this time German traders, and missioneries 'the legion that never was listed, that carries no colour nor crest' were pursuing their vocations throughout Africa far beyond the limit of their flag, generally under the aegis of the Union Jack.

Bismarck's Colonial Policy.

But the Iron Chancellor would not harken to their cry. "I want no colonies. They are only good for providing jobs. For us colonial enterprises would be just like the silks and sables in Polish noble families who for the rest have no shirts" he said in 1880. He declared "I am not a colony man". To him "colonies would only be a cause of weakness." His interests till then were European. He could not see beyond his nose then.

Public Opinion and Economic Pressure Compelled Bismarck to Embark on a policy of Colonial Expansion

By 1884 however, he was driven by public opinion and economic pressure to enter the colonial field (In 1882, 250,000 Germans had emigrated to foreign countries). "It is a remarkable fact", wrote the British Ambassador, Lord Ampthill, from Berlin in 1884, "that Bismarck, contrary to his convictions and his will, has been driven by public opinion to the colonial policy he had hitherto denounced as detrimental to the concentration of German strength."

Development of German colonies was facilitated by British acquiescence

It is generally not appreciated that the development of German colonies was facilitated by the resentment caused in France by the British occupation of Egypt. Britain needed support against the indignation of France and the jealousy of Russia. This could be found only in Germany, and Bismarck made acquiescence in the extension of German colonies a condition of German help.

It may be observed that it was Bismarck who had egged on France to acquire colonies to alleviate the mortification suffered by her at the loss of Alsace and Lorriane and that it was Britain who had facilitated the development of German colonies. In both cases the action was shortsighted and both Bismarck and Britain, had to ruefully acknowledge this fact later.

German colonial development

Bismarck had displayed remarkable patience and consideration before founding Germany's first colony ; but now he acted vigorously. Within one year (in 1884), Germany annexed South-West Africa, part of Togoland, the vast territory of the Kamerun, and Zanzibar in East Africa. In the same year, she staked out her claim to the north-eastern quarter of New Guinea in the Pacific and several neighbouring islands (which he christened the Bismark Archipelago). The next years (1885) the Marshall and Soloman Islands were declared possessions, and by the end of the decade Germany had come to an agreement with Britain and the United States concerning a condominium in the Samoan Islands. "The colonies thus acquired", as Gooch says, "without a fleet and without moving a soldier were widely separated from the mother country and from one another, were unsuited to settlement by white men, at any rate in large numbers ; but their possession increased the pride and self-confidence of the new-born German Empire, turned the eyes of the German people from the exclusive contemplation of the European chessboard to the larger problems of *Weltpolitik*, and ultimately stimulated the demand for maritime power".

British Reactions to Germany's Colonial Development

At first England's reaction was not unfavourable to Germany's colonial development. "If Germany is to become a colonising power" said Gladstone in the House of Commons after this sudden expansion, "all I say is, God speed her. She becomes our ally and partner in the execution of the great purposes of Providence for the advantage of mankind". But

the British government was very uneasy about this abrupt change of German policy. The British Foreign Secretary, Lord Granville, had been dilatory and vacillating in answering German enquiries which preceded these annexations; and the German move had been executed in that manner, at once, sly and brusque, which was characteristic of Bismarck's diplomacy. Acute friction arose between the two Powers, which before the end of century, with the growth of German naval power, developed into steady enmity.

German colonies in Africa

The German empire in Africa, acquired through the foresight and energy of her merchants and explorers, and held owing to the vigorous and determined action of Bismarck, had an area of 1,028,000 sq. miles, which was, however, not much larger than the Belgian Congo, and far smaller in extent than the African possessions of either Britain or France, who each held approximately one-third of the great Continent. The German colonies never became, during the thirty years of their tenure, a field for German immigration. In all the German colonies in 1914 the total white population was 28,846 of whom 23,952 were Germans and of these 5,746 were soldiers or military police. These territories had been regarded chiefly as areas for economic exploitation and as sources of raw materials for German industries. Their cost amounting in 1914 to about 8 million sterling—was regarded by the German tax-payer as part of the prestige of Germany as a World Power⁴.

Britain in Africa

In the scramble for Africa, Britain secured the lion's share by grabbing the best regions of the Continent. In the North she extended her control over Egypt and the Sudan. The acquisition of British East Africa, followed by the establishment of protectorate over Uganda, gave a continuous stretch of territory from the Indian Ocean to the Mediterranean. At the southern end of the Continent, Britain had established her

4. After the First World War the German colonies were distributed chiefly between Britain and France as mandatories under the League of Nations.

sway over the Cape Colony, Natal, Transval and Orange River Colony (Formed into the Union of South Africa in 1909). To the north of this Union, was the Protectorate of Bechunaland, and to its north, Rhodesia reaching southern boundary of German East Africa. Thus pushing north wards from the Cape Colony, Britain came to control an unbroken sweep of territory up to Lake Tanganyika, and, but for German East Africa, her colonial empire would have extended in a continuous stretch from the Cape of Cairo. Her other holdings in Africa included Gambia, the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Nigeria on the west and part of Somaliland on the east coast of Africa. Her territories in Africa excluding the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan comprised 2,700,000 sq. miles.

Final analysis

By the end of the nineteenth century Africa had been almost entirely divided by the Western Powers of Europe, as follows :

France	...	3,800,000	square miles
Britain	...	2,700,000	—do—
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan	...	610,000	—do—
Germany	...	1,028,000	—do—
Belgium (Congo Free State)	...	900,000	—do—
Portugal	...	790,000	—do—
Italy	...	188,000	—do—

Since then, Morocco had become, with the exception of small Spanish spheres, a French protectorate (1912), whilst Barotseland had been occupied by Britain.

At the beginning of the First World War the only territory in that vast continent controlled by the indigenous inhabitants were Abyssinia and Liberia : the former only because of the double failure of an Italian attempt at conquest (1885 and 1896), and the latter—a negligible negro republic only because of the prevalence of a humanitarian sentiment in the U.S.A. and Britain, associated with the abolition slavery.

Comments on the Partition of Africa

No sooner was the exploration of Africa nearing completion that a scramble for its partition among the power-hungry nations of Europe began. With regard to the partition of the Continent two features stand out prominently. First, it was accomplished without a European war. The scramble, no doubt, often led to frictions and diplomatic complications, but the powers made up their difference by the series of understandings among themselves, which settled the boundaries of their claims and defined their respective 'spheres of influence'. Secondly, the partition was not a slow, gradual process but an extraordinarily rapid operation. It began in right earnest in the seventies and was almost completed before the century was run out. The rapid partition was in no small measure due to the decision taken at the international conference at Berlin in 1884-85 to the effect that in future any power that effectively occupied African territory and duly notified the other Powers could thereby establish its sway over it. This gave the signal for the rapid grabbing of the Continent by all the colonial powers and inaugurated a new era of colonialism.

Nature of Colonialism

The colonising Powers subordinated all other considerations to the rapid acquisition of wealth at the expense of the natives. In the course of this immoral exploitation the humane enterprise of Christian missionaries was largely nullified. Even after the national governments of Europe felt compelled to intervene, their policy was for some years incoherent, because they subordinated the "African Question" to diplomatic exigencies in Europe, and to the private interests of their subjects.

The purely political problems of extending the apparatus of civilisation to Africa and incorporating its millions of vigorous native inhabitants, were relegated to regulated companies of the type of the old East India Company—a policy which Britain at least must have known—created many difficulties. The awful history of the Congo Free State was merely the worst example of this phase of intermittant political intervention ; for the conduct of the British South Africa Company

and the Imperial British East Africa Company was not unsullied by the crimes of unrestrained acquisitiveness sharpened by international rivalry in the regions 'beyond the law'. Bismarck cynically accepted such a condition and acted on the maxim that the flag should follow trade, and should only be hoisted when annexation would bring greater advantage than private enterprise. The German treatment of the natives in East, and South West Africa, provoked rebellions, which were only suppressed at great cost and without regard to native rights.

After the partition of the Continent had been almost completed, the people of Europe compelled their governments to apply in Africa the principles of disinterested political control in the interests of the native inhabitants, and the "Dark Continent" of the nineteenth century rapidly became a region of civilised enlightenment.

By 1914, the myth of the Dark Continent had been completely destroyed and the continent which knew no arrears was completely divided up among the imperialist powers, France, Britain, Germany, Belgium, Portugal and Italy.

Imperialists and the Middle East

Although the Middle East had been the seat of several important empires and civilizations in the ancient times, it continued to be a backward area. In this region, Russia and Britain became imperialist rivals. Russia for centuries, attempted to dominate the Black Sea area and the Persian Gulf. Catherine the Great of Russia had obtained some ports on the Black Sea from Turkey. In the nineteenth century Russia made efforts to obtain access to the Dardanelles and the Mediterranean Sea through the Crimean and Russo-Turkish wars. During the closing years of the nineteenth century Russia expanded southwards and Britain northwards. Britain and Russia nearly fought with each other but every time they had a temporary compromise. The countries at stake were Afghanistan and Baluchistan, Tibet and Persia. For a time after 1820, Britain and France dominated the area between Persia and the Mediterranean including Iraq, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Palestine.

Effects of Imperialism

In some respects, the imperialistic activities of modern European nations had important consequences. Jungles were cleared, prairies cultivated, means of transport and communications improved and diseases fought. There was the spread of education among the illiterate people of Asia and Africa. Imperialism stirred a fierce spirit of nationalism and resulted in revolutions.

But Imperialism had its other side also. It led to atrocities such as the one perpetrated in the Congo, and the conquest by force of unwilling nations followed by shameful exploitation. Not one of the Empire building countries of the world had a clean record in imperial matters. Even the British empire was established for commercial reasons and it would be absurd to argue or even imagine that it was maintained for purely philanthropic purposes. While imperialism had undoubtedly been a potent force in the civilizing of backward peoples, it had also been a prolific cause of wars and international discord. It was responsible for wars between Russia and Japan, and between Italy and Turkey and was one of the root causes of the war of 1914-18, the greatest and most horrible in the annals of history. The ill will between France and Germany was accentuated by Colonial rivalry over the matter of Morocco, where France with the approval of Great Britain claimed the right to establish a protectorate, Germany disputed the French monopoly and in 1911 almost went to war because France would not consult her in Moroccan matters. Six years earlier Great Britain had formally recognised French claims to Morocco in return for similar recognition of British interests in Egypt. Thus the "ENTENTE CORDIALE" between the two countries led to an understanding which had the effect of bringing the British Empire with all its resources to the support of FRANCE against Germany when the Great war began.

So much for Imperialism but in any case the new wave of imperialism that began over a hundred years ago seems to have died its natural death. The Empires lost their colonies after World War I and still others after World War II.

6

Aims, Achievements and Character of the French Revolution (1789-95)

It is usually not the strength but the weakness of existing institutions which brings about revolution. This is particularly true of France in 1789.

The causes of the revolution which began in that year had really been at work for a long time and undertaking the existing order of things in France. There were many causes which prepared the ground for this great upheaval—the French Revolution—which sounded the death knell of the *ancient regime* by shattering the structure of royal absolutism and destroying a social order based upon aristocratic privileges.

Unjust Social Order

One of the most important causes of the Revolution was the social disparity in France on the eve of Revolution. In its social structure, France then legally consisted, as had been the case for centuries past, of three classes or estates. The first and second estate, respectively, were the clergy and the nobility. They were alike distinguished by honours, properties and privileges. Both of them formed a very small minority of the total population of the country—in a total population of more than twenty-five million there were approximately 130,000 clergymen and an equal number of nobles. Their combined strength was thus one per cent of the total population

It is estimated that each of these two classes held about one-fifth of the land of France. Thus these privileged classes, constituting one per cent of population, owned forty per cent of the land of the country for which they paid no taxes.

The Clergy

The clergy had, of course, several welfare duties to perform but they were never rendered, and with the passage of time they had even been forgotten. Oblivious of their duties, the clergy competed with the nobility in the field of riches, lands and luxuries. To quote just one example, the Archbishop of Strasbourg had an annual income of 300,000 dollars.

In a manner of speaking, the Church was a state within the state. Apart from owning innumerable holdings of land, consisting perhaps of one fifth of the extent of the kingdom, the clergy for their own benefit levied a tax called the tithe on their landed parishners. It is no wonder that the Church came under fire at the hands of Voltaire, "Crush the infamous thing" he exclaimed.

It would be wrong to suppose that the huge income occurring to the Church was equitably divided among the clergymen of all shades. Even in the ranks of the clergy there was a disparity. A wholly disproportionate amount of the revenue was appropriated by the higher clergy, while the mass of parishhood, wearing themselves out in service of their parishners, received a pittance hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together. Not only that there was no love lost between the higher and lower clergy, the former even looked down upon the latter as a class apart "coarse, dirty and ignorant"—the crime of the lower clergy being that they discharged their normal duties and lived among the peasants sharing their food, sorrows and trials. "It was through no accidental, impulsive propulsion of emotion that the lower clergy forsook their order and joined the Third Estate in 1789." It was, therefore, hardly surprising if common suffering and mutual sympathies should lead the lower clergy and the third estate to common action against a regime that treated them so badly.

The Nobility

The rank of the nobility was acquired by virtue of birth, military service, purchase of nobility or holding certain public offices. Quite a number of well to-do commoners by purchasing vast estates of the old nobility (with patents of nobility, manorial rights and the titles of Dukes, Counts, and Viscounts) or by holding public offices attained the status of nobility. These constituted the official nobility, the nobles of the robes (the *nobesses de robe*), to distinguish them from the feudal nobility.

The nobles enjoyed unique privileges. They were exempt from most of the taxation—a burden borne only by the common man. The nobles had exclusive rights of hunting and fishing, of keeping doves and shooting. They enjoyed the privilege to levy tolls on roads and market-places. They possessed authority to enforce in their courts the obligations of the peasants who lived on their estates. The nobles were harsh and over bearing and were jealous of the maintenance of their privileges.

The Third Estate

Beneath the two privileged groups of higher clergy and nobility was the unprivileged mass of the nation called the third estate. The third estate had only duties and no privileges. They paid all the taxes to the state and enjoyed no rights in return. The great mass of the third estate was made up of peasants who constituted probably nine-tenths of the populations. (The third estate in towns and cities constituted the *bourgeoisie*, the middle class, which included industrial and commercial entrepreneurs, professional men, shopkeepers, and independent artisans).

Peasants

Out of about 23 million peasants in France on the eve of the French Revolution, hardly a million were then serfs—a condition that contrasted with most of Europe and most of peasants were nominally land holders to some extent.

The improved legal status of most of the peasants not being serfs—did not, however, save them from extreme exploitation. They paid many, often very vexatious, dues to the noble owner of the land ; they contributed the tithe to the church ; and they owed a long list of direct and indirect taxes to the king. Thus the peasants paid three times over. To the state they paid taxes, to the Church tithes, and to the nobles feudal dues. If the calculation of a close student of this period, that the exaction from these three sources absorbed four-fifths of the income of the peasant, could not be established with mathematical accuracy, one could be sure that in any case he was ground down by taxation and thus inhumanly burdened. The nobles, on the other hand, who “fought” and the clergy who “prayed” contributed an insignificant proportion of the revenue. The taxes were thus distributed in such a way that the bulk of them fell on the class least able to pay them.

There was thus a glaring inequality of all sorts in the French society on the eve of the Revolution which, directly and indirectly, was primarily responsible for its outbreak. It has been aptly said that “the Revolution of 1789 was much less a rebellion against despotism than a rebellion against inequality.”

Failure of the French Monarchy

It was Henry IV, the first ruler of the Bourban dynasty (1589—1610), who laid the foundation of absolute monarchy in France. During the reign of his successor, Louis XIII (1610—1643), the royal authority was consolidated chiefly through the instrumentality of his great Chief Minister, Due de Richelieu. The next reign that of the *le grand monarque* (the great monarch), *i.e.* Louis XIV (1643—1715) registered a further augmentation and consolidation of royal authority on account of the decline of the power and authority of the great magistrates or of the *parlement* of Paris*, and the mighty

* The *parlement* of Paris was a sovereign court which registered all royal acts.

and turbulent nobles of the realm. Louis XIV ardently believed that he ruled by the will of God and was responsible to Him alone for all his actions—divine rights theory, simple and pure. He was so autocratic and powerful that he could well boast "*L'etat, e'est moi.*" "I am the state." In consonance with this assertion, he said. "The sovereign authority is invested in my person, the legislative powers exist in myself alone...My people are one with me; natural rights and natural interests are necessarily combined with my own and only rest in my hands".

Successors of Louis XIV

By the time of the accession of Louis XV in 1715, there had arisen an excessive concentration of political, administrative, and judicial power in the hands of the crown at the expense of all the orders of the realm. Legislative power had once resided in Estates General of clergy, lords, and commons but no such body had been called in France since 1614; national laws had been replaced by royal edicts. With the creation and maintenance of such a vast centralization, administrative, legislative and judicial, the energy of the crown was exhausted.

Louis XV (1715—1774)

With such a ruler as Louis XV as its head, the central government of the kingdom could hardly receive careful and effective royal control. As G.P. Gooch has said, "His (Louis XV's) lamentable reputation in history derives less from what he did than from what he never tried to do. For him all evils were incurable." It is no wonder, therefore that "the legacy of Louis XV to his countrymen was an ill-governed, discontented frustrated France". Louis XV was in the words of M.S. Anderson "perhaps more hated and certainly more despised than any king of France for generations". Quite a number of Frenchmen had begun to question the very basis of the existing political and social order.

Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette

Louis XV's eldest son, the former Dauphin* had died in 1765. It was therefore, Louis XV's grandson, Louis XVI, who came to the throne in 1774 at his sudden death at the age of sixty-four. During Louis XVI's reign, events were to take a turn which within fifteen years were to bring the *ancient regime* to an end.

Louis XVI was twenty years old at his accession. A shy awkward looking man, prone to corpulence, he was completely devoid of his grandfather's graceful bearing, but he was in many ways a more praiseworthy character. Uniquely among the other Bourbon kings of France, he led a strictly moral life. "He was also kindly, honest, pious and almost pathetically well-meaning and full of good intentions." Yet he was singularly unfitted to be at the helm of affairs in France at that juncture when critical events stirred the country. He was thoroughly weak, vacillating and lacking in self-confidence. His vice was over-eating and over-drinking, his hobby was making and mending locks, and his chief pleasure was hunting, the traditional sport of French kings. Sometimes he spent so long in the hunting-field that he fell asleep from fatigue at council meetings during the discussion of business. On any day when there was no hunting, he felt ill at ease and completely lost, as he did on the day of the tennis-court oath in June, 1789 and on other important dates in that year, e.g., on the day in October when the women of Paris marched to Versailles. Unmistakably he gave the impression of living aloof and uncomprehending amid the critical events which stirred his kingdom. In fact Louis XVI never really grew up.

For every different reason, Marie Antoinette to whom Louis XVI had been married was equally unsuited for the position as the Queen. She was a daughter of Francis I and Maria Theresa. Her marriage was disliked in France by a strong party which was set dead against the Austrian alliance which she represented. To that important section of the

*Dauphin was the title of the eldest son of the King of France as Prince of Wales is the title conferred on the eldest son of the English sovereign.

people in France she was thus an "Unwanted Habsburg princess".

As was to be expected Marie Antoinette, a woman of unusual vivacity and charm, soon established an ascendancy over her husband to whom she was superior in ability. So feminine influence continued to prevail at the court. Louis XV had been guided by his mistresses, but his grandson was directed by his wife. Such influence as Marie Antoinette exercised on her dull and bewildered husband was prompted by nothing better than personal bias, and was usually harmful to the state. She had not been well educated and remained a foreigner who never understood France.

Moreover, she had little taste for politics, allowing herself to be guided simply by personal likes and dislikes. She tried to get French support for Austrian policy, which was often contrary to French interests; she was by no means always able to get what "she wanted" here, but her attempts acquired for her the derogatory nickname of '*l'Autrichienne*.'

The King and Queen were at one in just one thing their desire to be aloof. So they lived a life of their own, isolated from the rest of France. Except for a single visit by Louis to new harbour works at Cherbourg, they never journeyed beyond the royal chateaux around Paris. They even isolated themselves from the nobility of the court, who still counted for much and, for this isolation, the Queen was primarily responsible. Since she was so seldom among them in the functions of the court, the great noble men and their ladies rarely came to Versailles, thus eliminating points of contacts between the royalty and nobility.

The Queen's frivolity* destroyed her prestige, while her love of pomp and show, which ran counter to the policy of

*Just one example of her frivolity.

She made her favourite resort at Petit Trianon on the grounds of Versailles into a miniature village with twisting stream, rustic bridges and artificial waterfall, mill, kitchen, boundoors and ballroom by the side of a pond, where, she and her friends dressed themselves as Arcadian shepherds and shepherdesses to enjoy the simple delights of country life.

One can imagine the amount of money that would have been wasted just to satisfy one passing whim of the Queen.

strict economy required by the condition of the state finances, earned for her the nickname '*Madame Deficit*'.

The Queen's reputation was seriously marred by continual malicious attacks on her personal character made by court factions which were hostile to her. Suspicion and abuse of her character reached its height in 1785 with the mysterious affair of the diamond necklace, which Napoleon said marked the beginning of the French Revolution. This "affair" which did much to turn general public opinion against the Queen and so seriously undermined the prestige of the monarchy with the mass of the Frenchmen was briefly as under :

The Cardinal de Rohan who sought the Queen's favour was induced by the Countess de la Motte to purchase for the Queen a valuable diamond necklace originally made for Mme. du Barry, the mistress of Louis XV. The Cardinal handed the necklace to the Countess, who sold it to an English jeweller and kept the money. When the time for payment arrived, the jeweller who had made the necklace sent his bill to the Queen, who denied all knowledge of it. A trial followed, which, lasted nine months and occasioned an immense scandal and malicious gossip. The Cardinal though found innocent, was banished from the court ; the Countess de la Motte was flogged and branded ; but many suspected that the Queen was the real culprit in the case, and slanderous allegations were made against her. She was wildly supposed to have sold her favours to the Cardinal for the necklace and then to have refused to pay the price. The episode did much to turn general public opinion against her and so weaken the prestige of the monarchy. Louis troubles were in no small part due to the fact that he was henpecked by the queen Marie Antoinette. She was disliked because of her rash attempts to dictate governmental policies. She was largely responsible for the dismissal in 1776 of one minister Turgot who may have averted the Revolution and for thwarting Mirabeau in 1790, who possibly could have saved the monarchy.

The King had no able or reliable relative. It has been very aptly said of him that "he was *wretchedly alone in his incapacities*."

As L.W. Courie rightly asserts : "In 1774 the accession of a young king and his tall, graceful queen in place of dissolute old widower was naturally greeted with enthusiasm and loyalty in France. After Louis XV's long and inglorious reign, public opinion confidently hoped that the crown would lead the nation towards a better future ; but the weakness of the King and indiscretions of the Queen speedily brought disenchantment and steadily dissipated the national goodwill, and the seriously undermined prestige of the monarchy was to contribute towards the development of the situation which culminated in the outbreak of the Revolution."

Defects in Administration

The French Government besides being despotic was highly centralised. Matters great and small were taken up by the king's council at Versailles. Little liberty of action was left to local officials. Such trifles, such as the repair of a bridge or the sinking of a village well were referred to the council for approval ; consequently that body was overwhelmed with work. Delays occurred and decisions were often announced too late to be of use. The administration thus became very inefficient and people became greatly dissatisfied.

The Intellectual and Literacy Crusade

The eighteenth century was a very inquisitive, critical and sceptical century. In spite of the political conservatism of its governing classes, its judgment was far more ready to be enslaved by new ideas than by old ones. In so far as the French Revolution was concerned the intellectual ferment can best be discussed by studying the reconnaissance made by Montesquieu, the attack of Voltaire and the ultimate conquest achieved by Rousseau. Besides there were the Encyclopaedists there is no gainsaying the fact that the Revolution of 1789 "was not caused by the (French) philosophers, but by the conditions and evils of the national life and by the mistakes of the government. Nevertheless those writers were a factor in the Revolution, for they educated a group of leaders, instilled into them certain decisive doctrines, furnished them

with phrases, formulae and arguments, gave a certain tone and cast to their minds, imparted to them certain powerful illusions, encouraged an excessive hopefulness which was characteristic of the movement. They did not cause the Revolution but they exposed the causes brilliantly, focussed attention upon them, compelled discussion and aroused passion"—C.D. Hazen.

These men of letters demonstrated in innumerable ways the rottenness of the French institutions and expressed disenchantment with the *ancient regime*. They compared French institutions unfavourably with the English institutions and violently attacked the former with every weapon of invective, ridicule, ribaldry and innuendo. When, therefore, the French Revolution broke out their constant undermining had destroyed the self-confidence and prestige of the old order.

The giants of the age were Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Rousseau. Besides them there were the so-called the Encyclopaedists—writers who had contributed articles to the French Encyclopaedia which was designed to contain the sum of human knowledge at the time carefully strained and analyzed.

Montesquieu (1689-1755)

Baron de Charles de Secondat Montesquieu was a leading exponent of rationalism—the idea underlying rationalism was that everything should bear the test of reason.

His earliest work, *The Persian Letters*, was a satire on French society in which, by viewing it through the eyes of an imaginary Persian, he poked all manner of fun at a privileged aristocracy, the corruption of the court and the folly of religious intolerance.

In 1748, appeared his monumental "*De l' Esprit des Lois*" (*The Spirit of the Laws*) which brought him much acclaim. It was a study of political philosophy, of various forms of governments and their merits and demerits. Setting aside the claim of divinity for the institutions, he examined them with the detachment of a rationalist.

Mainly through the influence of Locke, Montesquieu attributed much of the success of the British constitution in

safeguarding individual freedom to the recognition that the powers of government were of three different kinds—executive legislative and judicial—which should be exercised by different persons. He imagined that this existed more markedly in the British constitution than it actually did, but no other conception of any political thinker had a more practical effect. It inspired rationalist critics of the oppressiveness of the *ancient regime* and stimulated the constitutional claims of the *parlement* of Paris (it was a sovereign court which registered all royal acts) just before the outbreak of the Revolution, while it exercised a decisive influence upon the framing of the constitution of the U.S.A. and the attempts at constitutional monarchy in revolutionary France.

Voltaire (1694—1778)

If Montesquieu may be said to have achieved most in practical result among the philosophers, the most famous and influential during his own life time was Francois-Marie Arouet, better known as Voltaire.

The prince of the rationalists, Voltaire was one of the masterminds in the history of Europe. His name has become the name of an era. We speak of the Age of Voltaire in the same way as we speak of the Age of Luther or the Age of Erasmus. Voltaire's rare and versatile wit, his light touch, his unabashed scepticism, his brilliant commonsense, appealed irresistibly to the minds of his countrymen.

Voltaire was a brilliant satirist who, in a series of poems, essays and other works, unsparingly criticised the social and political institutions of his time. His chief target was the Roman Catholic church of his time, which he regarded as a barrier to human progress and as a privileged nuisance. *Ecrasez l'infame* (Crush the vile thing) was his slogan in respect of Church. He also exposed the absurdity of feudal privileges. As a reformer he ploughed deeper than Montesquieu, for he did not hesitate to attack "privilege". In his slashing attacks on the Church and other pillars of the *ancient regime* he was nothing short of a crusador. He exhorted his countrymen to apply reason rather than tradition as a test of established institutions, and to condemn those which failed to justify themselves when judged in this way.

Thanks to his brilliant pen, he enjoyed a celebrity far greater than any of the other philosophers.

Rousseau (1712—1778)

While most of the philosophers belonged to the wealthy *bourgeoisie* and shared their political aims, Jean-Jacques Rousseau came from a lower social class. The ideal of equality before the law, so strongly desired by other thinkers, was not enough to satisfy Rousseau, and his writings appear the first aspirations of the down-trodden class, to which he himself belonged for social and economic equality.

Rousseau's monumental work *Du Contract Social* (*the Social Contract*) was published in 1762. In this work he held the opinion that civilised society was based on a "social contract". He thought that in the remote past men had lived in state of nature and that they had come to an agreement to live together under a government in order that life and property might be protected. The existing contract, he thought, to be unfair, as it favoured the privileged classes unduly, and advocated a "return to nature" and the formation of a new and more satisfactory contract. He was, therefore, all for the demolition of the existing institutions, and the establishment of a form of government which would ensure that the "general will" was sovereign. In other words an entirely new "social contract" must be made.

The adherents of Rousseau's ideas became extreme revolutionaries who wanted to abolish French institutions as completely as possible, and to build them up again from the beginning. His ideas exercised great influence among the leaders of the French Revolution, notably the Jacobins between 1791 and 1793, and Robespierre in particular.

In assessing the influence of Rousseau, Lord Morley observed: "In the first place he (Rousseau) spoke words that can never be unspoken and kindled a hope that can never be extinguished; he first inflamed man with righteous conviction, with the evils of the existing order of things, reduced civilization to a nullity for the great majority of mankind.....; second, by his fervid eloquence and the burning convictions

which he kindled in the heart of great number of men, he inspired energy enough in France to awaken her from the torpor as of death which was stealing so rapidly over her.

The Encyclopaedists

In the middle of the eighteenth century was published the *French Encyclopaedia* which contained articles in alphabetical order on all questions of philosophy and religion, literature and aesthetics, politics and political economy, theoretical and technical science.

Denis Diderot (1713-1784) with the aid of a multitude of collaborators—notably D'Alembert, Voltaire, Montesquieu, Turgot, Neckor and Mirabeau (the father of more famous Mirabeau of the Revolution) prepared the text of the *Encyclopaedia*. The object underlying the preparation of the *Encyclopaedia* was to express the sceptical, rationalist attitude of the French philosophers on various matters. The *Encyclopaedia* became in some respects a vehicle of criticism, since by implication at least many existing abuses in French life and society were denounced. Needless to point out that some of the articles in the *Encyclopaedia* brought home to the people of France that the state of affairs in their country, particularly in the fields of religion and society, was deplorable.

Role played by the philosophers in bringing about the Revolution

We have already examined the views of an eminent historian C.D. Hazen in this connection. According to Mallet, "The seed sown by these remarkable writers fell upon fruitful soil...An enthusiasm for the natural greatness of man and a boundless contempt for the age of society in which he lived prevailed the thought of the time. In almost every European country observers noticed the same presentiment of impending change—a change which on behalf of humanity most people were prepared to welcome. Thinkers and talkers alike were full of illusions, full of curiosity, full of selfishness, full of hope." David Thomson is of the opinion that the connection between the ideas of the *philosophers* (as the philosophers are

called) and the outbreak of the French Revolution “is somewhat remote and indirect. They did not preach revolution, and were usually ready enough to lend support to any absolute monarch who was prepared to patronize them and adopt their teachings. Nor were most of their readers inspired to want, or to work for, revolution ; they were mostly themselves aristocrats, lawyers, business people, and local dignitaries, whose lot in the existing order was far from unhappy. The doctrines of the *philosophers* came to be used later on, during the course of the revolution in France, often to justify measures that the *philosophers* themselves would have opposed. Their teachings become more important later ; if they had any influence at all on the outbreak and the initial stages of the great revolution, it was only to the extent they had fostered a critical irreverent attitude towards all existing institutions. They made men more ready, when the need arose, to question the whole foundation of the old order. What mattered in 1789—and what made men revolutionary almost in spite of themselves—was the whole ‘revolutionary situation’ ; and in producing that situation the work of the *philosophers* played no very important role.”

In correctly assessing the role played by the *philosophers* in precipitating the French Revolution, one could say that they heralded the Revolution, but they did not originate it. They were rather its effect than its cause.

(e) Impact of the American War of Independence

The intervention of France in this war accelerated her movement on the road to bankruptcy. It also familiarised thousands of Frenchmen with the idea of a right, proper resistance to what was regarded to be a lawfully constituted authority. Lafayettes and his friends came back to Paris to chatter of bravery, heroism and colonial ideals. In America the situation had been remedied by means of a revolution. What was there to prevent the situation in France being remedied too ?

(f) Financial bankruptcy

According to David Thomson quoted above what mattered in 1789 was the whole 'revolutionary situation' the essence of which was "that the King, who was the linchpin of the whole established social and political system in France was in desperate financial straits." Let us, therefore, turn our attention to those desperate financial straits.

Financially France never caught up after the reign of Louis XIV (1643—1715), and the reign of his successor, Louis XV (1715—1774), served to put her deeper into the mire due to criminal extravagance of court and to eighteenth century wars with England*

Shortly after Louis XVI came to the throne of his unmourned predecessor years of disorder in the royal treasury seemed to have come to an inevitable climax.

By 1787 the financial position of France was well nigh desperate. She staggered under the burden of a huge national debt.

The financial situation in France exhibited the following ominous features :

(i) A large debt inherited from the past ; (ii) an obstinate annual deficit ; and (iii) an embittered public unwillingness to bear additional taxation. The result was that treasury was

*Since 1689 France and England were engaged in one long struggle. The main phases of acute conflict can be summarized as follows :

(i) The War of the League of Augsburg, 1689—97 concluded by the Treaty of Ryswick.

(ii) The War of the Spanish Succession, 1702—13, concluded by the Treaty of Utrecht.

(iii) The War of the Austrian Succession, 1740—48, concluded by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle. This began in 1739 with the War of Jenkins's Ear between England and Spain. France and England were not at war until 1744.

(iv) The Seven Years War, 1756—63, concluded by the Treaty of Paris

(v) The War of American Independence, 1778—83, concluded by the Treaty of Versailles.

These wars and the 2,000 million dollars that France spent in aiding the American Colonies in their war against England had completely exhausted the finances of France.

empty, taxation could no longer be increased and a loan could no longer be raised. Thus financial bankruptcy was at hand. There was only one possible remedy—a levy on “privilege”, which meant that the privileged classes who had been exempt from the bulk of taxation should be made to sacrifice their immunity from taxation. This they stoutly refused to do. It was a suicidal attitude for the nobles to adopt for as A. Goodwin observes : “It (the French Revolution) was set in motion by the aristocracy in the years 1787 and 1788 in the attempts to defend its own fiscal and political privileges” in the face of an acute financial crisis.

The French finances were thus in atrocious confusion, and the finances were, as they still are, the most revealing touchstone of every government’s solidity. Something had immediately to be done about the finances, if the services of the state were not to break down and the government cease to function.

King Louis XVI was at his wit’s end. In act of desperation on July 5, 1788, he issued a call for the *Estate Generaux* (the Estates-General), which was the nearest institution France had to a parliament representative of the whole nation. This call was followed by another on August 8th, which summoned the body to meet on May 1st, 1789. The summoning of the Estates General which had not met since 1614 was of tremendous moral significance. Undoubtedly it indicated a defeat for the monarchy and marked a definite shifting of the moral leadership from the crown to the nation as a whole. The summoning of the Estates-General opened the way for the revolution. In this connection we may quote A. Goodwin : “The immediate causes of French Revolution of 1789 must be sought, not in the economic grievances of the peasants, nor in the political discontent of the middle class, but in the reactionary aspirations of the French aristocracy...The decision of Louis XVI, in July, 1788 to summon the Estates-General marked the Crown’s capitulation to the concerted pressure of the lay, ecclesiastical and judicial aristocracy. These privileged classes expected that the adoption of traditional methods of voting in the Estates-General—by order and not by head—would enable them, not only to prevent radical reform, but also to consoli-

date their victory over the crown by a similar subjugation of the third estate. This gross miscalculation rendered inevitable a revolution which might well have been avoided by the nobility's acceptance of the consequences of political and fiscal equality.

To sum up : An unjust division of society, a rotten political system, an unfair system of taxation, financial bankruptcy of the state, the personal characters of Louis XVI, and his Queen Marie Antoinette, coupled with the influence of the French philosophers, brought about the French Revolution.

Postscript. We might as well discuss two more important questions arising out of the theme under review : Why did the Revolution come in France alone in 1789 ? and (ii) how does the French Revolution stand in comparison with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England ?

(i) *Why did the Revolution come in France alone ?* It is really significant that the Revolution came in France alone while the general conditions of the people were practically the same, in some ways worse, in other countries of Europe. There were many reasons for this which may be summarized.

In other countries there were feudal privileges, no doubt, like those in France, but there were duties also. The feudal lords in other countries, for example, served in the army and were responsible for maintaining law and order in their respective estates. In the case of France, however, the situation was different. In that country, while the nobles still retained their exemptions and privileges, they were deprived of all their powers and absolved of their duties by the king. The result was that while in other countries the feudal system was a reality, in France it had lost all vitality and had become worn out. There was, therefore, no rational ground for its continuance in France, and yet it was very much there. It is no wonder, therefore, that the people in France felt irritated with the system particularly, and strove to abolish it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Another reason was that in France there existed a powerful and enlightened middle class which was not to be found in other parts of Europe. The merchants, the traders, the professors and the lawyers were wealthy and rich and were

endowed with brains, and yet they had no share in the administration, which was most acutely felt. It was this class in France which formed the vanguard of the Revolution.

Then France alone produced a set of philosophers, who had a tremendous influence on the people. They had prepared the minds of the French by their writings to uproot the established order. In fact, the writings of these philosophers put before the people an idealism for which the latter were prepared to make any sacrifices. No such atmosphere existed in other countries of Europe. Although the unprivileged classes in other countries of Europe also suffered, they had neither any idealism before them, nor any leaders among them who were prepared to challenge the existing order, and hence no revolution broke out there.

The American War of Independence greatly influenced France in bringing about changes in French society and government, for the simple reason that a large number of the French soldiers had fought in the war side by side with American colonists, and had been inspired with the spirit of freedom and liberty. Naturally, on their return to France, they felt that they should also fight for liberty and equality. Other inhabitants also took their cue from them and aspired for those rights.

There was still another reason why the Revolution started in France and not in any other country of Europe. France staggered under the burden of a huge national debt, which had been increasing by leaps and bounds, year after year, due to extravagance of the court and to eighteenth century wars—wars with Britain for colonies. Things came to a head, and it became well nigh impossible to carry on the government due to bankruptcy of the state. Under the circumstances, the estates-general had to be summoned to rehabilitate the finances, and this step precipitated the Revolution in France. There were no such circumstances in other parts of Europe, and although the people there had their grievances, they kept on suffering without a thought of revolting.

(ii) *Comparison between the French Revolution and the Glorious Revolution*—In comparing the French Revolution of 1789 with the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, we may

observe that the aim of the English Revolution was to attain entirely political ends. Its object was to curb the arbitrary power of the King, and transfer all the powers to parliament as the chosen representative of the people. On the other hand, the French Revolution was more a rebellion against inequality in society than against despotism. It is true that the people of France had their political disabilities, but they had got so much accustomed to authoritarian rule extending over centuries that they had ceased bothering about it, and had, consequently, taken it in their stride. They were mainly concerned with the removal of social inequalities which haunted them.

The English Revolution was accomplished without bloodshed, without massacre, without guillotine, and without the reign of terror. It secured the triumph of parliamentary government over kingly despotism 'by consent and compromise'. Moreover, it was defensive and conservative in character. No drastic change was introduced as a result of it. No breach with the past took place because of it. On the other hand, the French Revolution was violent in its character and destructive in its effects.

The Etats Generaux (The Estates-General)

In January, 1789 in the midst of an unsurpassed excitement, elections began to take place for a meeting of the Estates General summoned after a lapse of one hundred and seventy five years. To the general Public in France the meeting of the Estates General seemed almost like a mystic "open sesame" (a spell or other means of making barriers fly open—from the story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves in *Arabian Nights*) "What might not this historic assemblage accomplish? Great events must surely follow"; "France would be regenerated" were some of the affirmations made by a large number of Frenchmen.

The Cashiers. It was customary before a meeting of the Estates-General, for assemblies of electors to draw up lists of grievances—*cashier de doleances*. In each constituency these were merged into an address for presentation by its deputy to

the crown. Each member had, therefore, brought with him a *cashier*, or list of complaints from his constituency. There were about 600 of these addresses finally presented at Versailles in 1789.

These covered a multitude of subjects, from a general demand for a 'constitution' and liberty of the individual, to a request to be allowed to keep a cat, to light a fire without payment of a due, etc. Nevertheless, a certain uniformity among the *cashiers* reveals some attempt at an organization. By and large, the *cashiers* from the towns were drawn up by the fairly wealthy *bourgeoisie* and demanded equality with the privileged classes, while those from the country parishes came from the larger farmers and wanted the abolition of feudal dues. The *cashiers* of the clergy and the nobility, on the other hand, showed that both these estates wished to retain their distinctive advantages and immunities. It was thus quite clear that the privileged aristocracy and the unprivileged *bourgeoisie* (the middle class of citizens) that was now raising its head in France were at cross purpose. As for the poorer peasantry, they had not yet expressed themselves; their grievances did not come to the surface until the revolt of the rural population in the weeks following the fall of Bastille.

The First Encounter

The Estates-General was formally opened by Louis XVI at Versailles on May 5th, 1789. In its composition those opposed to the *ancient regime* (the *bourgeoisie* and the parish priests) out-numbered those likely to defend it (the nobles and bishops). The Estates-General certainly did not meet with the intention of overthrowing the government of France and destroying the monarchy and nobility, but it was expected to be called upon to sanction reforms which would enable the government to be carried on more smoothly and satisfactorily and which would restore order in the finances. If the Government had been prepared to present to the Estates General a scheme of reforms, there is little doubt that body would have discussed it, perhaps modified it, and then adopted it. But the Government was not ready; it gave no lead to the Estates-General; and the first two months were spent in a wrangle

whether the Estates-General should resolve itself into three separate chambers as had been the case in 1614—in which case the first and the second estates (comprising deputies of the privileged classes) would outvote the third or whether they should meet and vote as one body. Naturally, the privileged classes clamoured for the first alternative, that is voting by “Order” (*par ordre*) while the unprivileged agitated for the second that is voting by “Head” (*par tete*), taking their stand on the plea that the Estate General of 1789 was not a feudal assembly but represented the people of France. They wanted the Estates-General to sit as a single body and each member to have one vote. The result was that there was a tussle between the privileged and unprivileged for the control of the Estates-General. As has been aptly put, “It is no longer but very secondarily a question of the king, of despotism, and of the constitution ; it is a war between the Third Estate and the two other orders”.

Before the meeting of the Estates-General, the claims of the Third Estate, the unprivileged class, became the subject of an exhilarating pamphlet literature. The theories of the French ‘philosophic’ movement of the eighteenth century had been thought into the realm of action, and popular passions had been aroused.

The Third Estate constitutes itself the National Assembly

In former times a French king desiring to tax the privileged orders would have combined with the Third Estate to crush the classes that chiefly menaced his power ; but Louis XVI and his queen living in an artificial world at Versailles out of touch with their people, were moved, perhaps, rather by their social sympathies than by their knowledge of the interests of the crown. They failed to support the radical demands of the Third Estate, and the first revolutionary act occurred when the Third Estate on June 17, accepting the consequences of their acts, passed a decree to the effect that, representing as they did ninety-six per cent of the nation, they and only they were qualified to voice its will ; hence they constituted themselves the “National Assembly” and invited members of the nobility

and clergy to sit with them. At the same time it was declared that any future taxation, which was not approved by the nation's representatives, was illegal. It was, of course, a step which none but the king had the legal right to take. The Third Estate was taking the law into its own hands.

The Oath of the Tennis Court

The "illegal" formation of the National Assembly was a clear challenge to the monarchy. The royal ministers now decided that the King should preside over a joint session of the three orders of the Estate General, though they could not clearly agree what should be done at that session. On June 20th, when the deputies of the Third Estate came for the meeting, they found the door of the Hall closed, and guarded by the troops. They were told that the Hall was being renovated for the royal sessions to be held later. The members of the Third Estate under Bailley, the First President of the National Assembly, rushed to near-by building which was used as a royal indoor tennis court, where they swore not to separate until they had drawn up a constitution for France. It became obvious that the Third Estate calling itself the National Assembly would not retreat at the order of the King. The Revolution had begun.

The Union of the Three Estates

On June 22nd, the majority of the clergy joined the third estate thus swelling its ranks. When the royal session was held Louis XVI declared in unequivocal terms that the distinction between the three orders must be maintained completely and ordered the third estate to abandon its plans. Thereupon, Comte de Mirabeau (1749—1791) who was the first of revolutionary leaders to form a policy, which included the abolition of privilege and inequality and also the establishments of a constitution, reported by saying that the deputies would only give way at the point of bayonet. A group of liberal minded nobles at this stage joined the ranks of the Third Estate. On June 27th, however, four days after the royal session, Louis XVI probably unhinged by news that a mob was

planning to march from Paris to Versailles, retracted from his earlier position, and ordered the two privileged estates to join the third estate in forming one assembly. Thus the National Assembly had triumphed in the long initial battle. Bailley, President of the Assembly jubilantly exclaimed ; "This day (June 27th, 1789) will be illustrious in our annals." On July 7th, a committee was appointed to draft a constitution. Henceforth we shall speak of the "Constituent Assembly."

Louis XVI's Efforts to Regain Lost Ground

The King, however, did not regard his capitulation as final. He was still determined to crush the Assembly and regain his lost ground. From July 1st, royal troops began to move from the provinces to Versailles and the region of Paris. The Government made it known that these measures were being taken to protect the Assembly and prevent disorder in Paris, but people at large were not convinced. They believed that troops movements were being undertaken to overawe them. To make matters worse, the delegates of the privileged orders who had earlier obeyed the royal order, though reluctantly, to unite with the third estate to form a single body now kept away from the Assembly's debates. On July 11th, the King took another step, he suddenly dismissed Necker, who had been advising concessions to the third estate, and formed a new ministry composed of men of reactionary views. It was now widely believed that the King intended to dissolve the Assembly and repudiate the national debt and thus inflict another two serious blows on the third estate.

It would be obvious from the foregoing account that Louis XVI was at that time following a weak and vacillating policy, when the need of the hour was firm handling of situation. The privileged aristocracy, on their part, were not reading the writing on the wall and were willfully shutting their eyes to the impending danger.

The First Insurrectionary Act (July 14th, 1789)

The happenings in Versailles were not without their effect in Paris, where demonstrations and riots were now on the

increase due to the inability of the Government to prevent disorder. Inspired by revolutionary pamphlets and infuriated by various acts of omission and commission of the Government, the mob in Paris, in search of arms, captured and razed to the ground the royal fortress of the Bastille, situated in the heart of the city, on July 14th, 1789. For some time the Bastille had been chiefly used as a prison to confine persons in custody indefinitely without trial, and as such seemed to many the symbol of oppressive despotism. (though, as a matter of fact, there then were only four coiners, two madmen and a dissolute young nobleman kept there by the wish of his family—but seven inmates, all of them common criminals).

Significance of the Fall of Bastille

The “taking” of the Bastille was felt to be a symbol of the overthrow of the *ancien regime*. It indicated that the king no longer controlled Paris and could not hope to regain it even with his mercenary troops. The fall of the Bastille was hailed by contemporaries as an event of the first magnitude, and such it proved to be. C.J. Fox exclaimed on hearing the news from Paris: “How much is this the greatest and best event that has ever happened.” As pointed out by A. Goodwin “No other single event in the revolution had so many-sided or far-reaching result as the fall of the Bastille. It marked the end of royal despotism in France, completed the transfer of political authority to the national legislature, and by encouraging the peasants to revolt, paved the way for the fall of feudalism. It freed the country from the restraints of press censorship and thus led to the rise of popular journalism, the political effect of which was amply demonstrated in the preparation of the next revolutionary *journee* in the following October. It was accompanied by an important revolution in the municipal administration of Paris and was quickly followed by an almost complete decentralization of government. It provoked the first emigration of the reactionary nobility, led by Count of Artois, and set in train the forces that led, in time, to foreign intervention and war with Europe. ...The fall of the fortress was widely acclaimed as heralding a new birth of liberty, not only in France, but throughout the World.”

The 14th of July was the second of the great days of the Revolution. The 27th of June had given supreme legislative authority to the assembly ; the fall of the Bastille on July 14th established the sovereignty of the people.

So wild was the enthusiasm throughout France at the fall of the Bastille that 14th of July was declared a national holiday. A new flag—the tricolour, red, white and blue—was adopted as the flag of the revolutionary France replacing the old white banner of the Bourbons. A National Guard was created in Paris and Marquis de Lafayette, the hero of French participation in the American war of Independence, was appointed its commander. Soon it came to have a force of 48,000 strong. A new municipal council known as the “Commune” was set up for Paris by its people. It was to consist of the chosen representatives of the various localities of Paris—the same that had elected representatives to the Estates-General.

Uprising of the Peasantry and Downfall of Feudalism

16000 It was hardly to be expected that the “July Riots” in Paris would be without their effects on the provinces where the population consisted chiefly of the peasantry. Now, at last, even “these more sluggish members of humanity”—the peasants of France—, taking their cue from the events in Paris awoke from their slumber and raised the standard of revolt in the provinces. For the peasants, above all things, feudalism was the bane. So from the middle of July on through August, 1789, the peasants plundered the *chateaux*, —the ‘Bastilles’ of the villages—the symbol of feudal despotism, taking special pains to destroy all the document of titles of the nobles—“the records of the peasants servitude.” A large number of nobles were put to death and their castles razed to the ground. But the feudal lords were not the only victims of the peasants’ wrath. Agents of the tax farmers were sometimes beaten or even put to death, and the same fate befell those millers who had often defrauded the peasants. The revolt in the countryside had become —even more than in Paris—a social upheaval.

The King Relents

Perceiving the temper of the people, Louis XVI relented. He reinstated Necker, dispersed the troops, and recognised the new administrative set up of Paris, the National Guard and the new flag—the Tricolour. But this was not the end of the matter. There, were, however, other influences working on the weak and vacillating Louis XVI which he could not resist and which deflected him from the path he had so far chosen to placate his subjects.

Attempts at a Counter-Revolution

The Queen and the Court were against the yielding tactics of the King. They wanted him to adopt a tough line against the recalcitrant section and not to agree to the reforms of the Assembly. The King gave in. He subordinated his own judgment in the matter to the “wiser” counsels of his charming and vivacious Queen and court. Efforts were then made to stage a counter-revolution against the populace of Paris. Some of the crack troops were summoned to Versailles from Flanders. A sumptuous banquet was arranged in the court theatre for the officers of the Flanders Regiment on the night of October 1st, 1789 at which the King and Queen were present. The guests indulged in enthusiastic demonstrations of loyalty and counter-revolutionary shouts. While Paris was virtually starving, Versailles was gay with drinks and dinners.

March of Women to Versailles.—News of lavish feasts at Versailles stung the people of Paris to the quick. Rumours were widespread in Paris that the Revolution had been insulted by the Tricolour having been stamped upon by the loyal troops during the orgy at the palace at Versailles, and that the Queen had encouraged all things. The Parisians became furious and clamoured for the blood of the perpetrators. There was witnessed in Paris on October 5th a strange and uncouth spectacle of a march of some six or seven thousand women, mad with hunger and rage, into Versailles, accompanied by the riff-raff of the population, to clamour for bread, and perhaps minded also to get the “royal baker” and bring him to Paris. Armed with sticks and clubs,

the women carried a few pieces of cannon also with them. Lafayette, with some of his National Guards, followed them at a discreet distance to prevent any untoward incident. The eight mile highway from Paris to Versailles was covered with cries and slogans of the Parisian women. The crowd reached Versailles in the evening and surrounded the royal palace. The vast courtyard of the palace as also the streets of Versailles were thronged with women from Paris. They were shouting, howling, and cursing. Even the fixed bayonets of the Royal Guards were weakening and giving way, both literally and figuratively. Only Lafayette could save the situation. He undertook to guard the royal family with volunteers. He also made adequate arrangement for the feeding and housing of the women for the night. However, early in the morning of October 6th, after some of the more turbulent elements had got drunk, there was an attack upon the palace and two of its guards were killed. At this juncture Lafayette ordered his guards to clear the palace and thus rescued the royal family. Then, after the King, the Queen and the Dauphin (the little prince) wearing Tricolour cockades had shown themselves on a balcony to the assembled rabble, the Commander of the National Guards persuaded the King to assent to its demand that he should go to Paris. Evidently, the women of Paris had won the day. Even the Queen had joined the Revolution. Arrangements were now made for the return journey.

The Funeral March of the Old Monarchy

One significant achievement of this "march" was that the King was persuaded and forced to change the headquarters of his Government to Paris and himself to live amidst his people. At two o'clock on October 6, in the mud and rain started the return procession. It was a weird procession—women of Paris, accompanied by Lafayette, the revolutionary hero of the two continents, and his guardsmen and lugging some wagons full of wheat and flour which they had commandeered, escorting the royal family to the Tuileries in Paris, the old royal palace which Louis XIV had deserted a century previously. According to legend, the crowd shouted throughout the entire route to Paris. "We have the baker and baker's

wife and the baker's little boy—now we shall have bread.” the procession has been aptly described as “the funeral march of the old monarchy.”

It was the second occasion when the populace played an important role in the Revolution. It displayed this time even more strikingly its power over the crown. A new chapter in the history of France had begun. The King was now a virtual prisoner of the Paris mob. He could be a constitutional monarch only under obvious compulsion.

The Assembly, not wishing to be left in isolation at Versailles, voted ten days later to transfer itself also to Paris. The Government was to be under Parisian influence for the next five years.

The Constituent Assembly (June 1789—September 1791)

It was on June 27th, 1789 that King Louis XVI, probably provoked by news that a mob was planning to march from Paris to Versailles, ordered that the two privileged estates were to unite with the third estate to form a single body known as the “Constituent Assembly.” The pressing task of this body was to frame a new constitution and method of government.

The *ancien regime* had been a patchwork of monarchical and feudal survivals to which more recent institutions had been added with great variety in different parts of the country. Now an attempt was to be made to give the state a completely new and unified system of administration.

Its Work : (i) *Abolition of the inequalities and injustices of the Old Regime.* By far the most significant work of the Constituent Assembly was to sound the death knell of feudalism, existing remnants of serfdom and class privilege.

On the night of August 4th, 1789, to be recalled henceforth as the “night of dupes”, one of the nobles, the Viscount of Noailles, (pronounced no. i), a relative of Lafayette rose in his seat, rushed to the rostrum and eloquently stated that the prime reason for the uprising of the peasants was the odious burden of feudal dues. He emphatically maintained that the remedy lay not in repressing the peasants but in putting an end to inequality, which according to him, was at the root of

all the trouble. Next to speak in the same strain was the Duke D' Aiguillon (pronounced a-gueyon) one of the largest landed proprietors of the country. He was followed by the others. Noble vied with noble in the matter of the renunciation of the privileges and age-old properties. The clergy also enthusiastically supported the move. It was in this atmosphere that the Assembly all through the night of 4th August, passed decree after decree to the tune of thirty, abolishing serfdom, feudal jurisdiction, manorial rents, tithes, laws, saleable offices, clerical fees, unequal taxation and municipal and provincial rights.

In short, all the special privileges of aristocratic classes as also all municipal, corporate and provincial privileges were done away with. *The ancien regime* had crumbled into pieces without a hope of redemption. It should, however, be borne in mind that the role of the Assembly in passing those decrees hardly exceeded that of casting in legislative form what had already been accomplished by the peasants by the use of force. "The surrender of their feudal rights and fiscal immunities by the aristocracy and clergy on the night of 4th August was not, therefore, the product of spontaneous generosity." In fact it was a stage-managed show, knowing full well that they had already lost the battle, they just tried to make a virtue of the necessity in the Assembly.

It must be pointed out that the Assembly, by endorsing what had already been done by the peasants by the use of force unmistakably gave the impression to the people that they could do what they liked with impunity and thus gave spurt to anarchy. Yet it is difficult to see how the Assembly could have avoided it.

(ii) *The Declaration of the Rights of Man*. (August 26th, 1789). The making of the new constitution for France had been under the active consideration of the Assembly since July, 1789. On a motion of Lafayette, the Assembly determined to publish by way of preface a clear statement of the rights and liberties of the individual following the example of the American colonists. On August 26th, therefore, was adopted the "Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen" after lengthy debate in the Assembly.

This document reflected the spirit of Rousseau's philosophy and incorporated some of the provisions of the "Magna-Carta" and the American Declaration of Independence*. It was for the most part a statement of lofty, yet moderate principles, and a dignified repudiation of the old order.

The Question of Fundamental Rights

The document proclaimed "for all men, for all times for every country, and as an example to the whole world" that "men are born and remain free and equal in rights"—this was the cardinal principle asserted by the "*Declaration*". Other rights of men were: sovereignty was vested in the "nation", the sovereignty being expressed in the law, "the expression of the general will as it was put in the document, following Rousseau, "Liberty" and "property" were declared to be natural rights" and "no one should be disturbed on account of his opinions, even religious, provided their manifestation does not derange the public order established by law." Freedom from oppression was to be secured by the abolition of arbitrary arrest. Civic equality was guaranteed. It was declared that "the people have a right to control the finances of the state."

Lacunae in the "Declaration"—In the Declaration, religious freedom and freedom of the press were somewhat qualified; even later the Assembly, when it decreed religious toleration, never granted to non-Catholics the right of public worship. The "Declaration" did not include the right of public meeting

*The constitution committee of the French National Assembly was influenced by the American state constitutions. It referred to the Bill of Rights as "the noble idea conceived in another hemisphere" and urged its adoption in these fitting words—"we assisted in the events which gave to North America her liberty; she shows to us upon what principles we should preserve ours."

Richard B. Morris in *The Emerging Nation and the American Revolution* wryly remarks that the Virginia statesman George Mason might well have instituted an action for plagiarism against the authors of the Declaration of Rights of Man and the Citizen which the French National Assembly adopted on August 26th, 1789. The resemblance to Mason's Bill of Rights which the Virginia Assembly had enacted back in June of 1776 is, indeed, very close.

or association among its fundamental rights—though formation of political clubs was to be tacitly permitted. Likewise it made no mention of economic enterprise or of trade. It said nothing about education or social security. The omissions may be ascribed to the fact in August 1789, when the “Declaration” proclaimed, people were still in the ecstatic stage of the Revolution. To the Assembly the matters referred to above, though all important in themselves, were less relevant to the immediate tasks of pulling down the *ancient regime*.

Defects in the “Declaration”—Although the “Declaration” responded to the needs of the hour, yet it suffered from certain inherent defects which embroiled the Assembly into serious trouble. The declaration of fundamental rights was premature, for as the practical Mirabeau felt such rights as were here proclaimed might be intoxicating to the people ; it was he said lifting a veil too quickly. The proper course for the Assembly was to have reminded the people of their civic duties rather than of their rights for “men are more prone to insist on their rights than to fulfil duties.” But the “Declaration” was a declaration of rights, not a declaration of duties. The “declaration” raised hopes among the popular masses, which the Assembly afterwards found impossible to fulfil and thus it raised a hornets’ nest about its ears. Take for instance, the right to control finances. It clearly implied universal suffrage but the Assembly was not prepared to grant this right to the poor classes. This contradiction led to no end of acrimonious and heated debates verging on actual animosity for years to come.

The Importance of “Declaration”

In spite of its short-comings the “Declaration” remains one of the most notable documents in the history of Europe. It has been described as “the death certificate of the old regime” ; “the most remarkable fact in the history of the growth of democratic and republican ideas” ; “the gospel of modern times ” ; “an indisputable factor in the political and social evolution of the modern world” and so on. It certainly remained a charter of liberalism throughout the nineteenth century.

The famous Declaration has remained of considerable importance ever since, and as recently as 1946 was "reaffirmed" in the preamble to the constitution of the Fourth French Republic.

According to David Thomson, "It was a Declaration of the *Right of Man*—a statement intended to have universal application and which certainly had very far-reaching implications. It was drawn up not for France alone, but for the benefit of men every where who wanted to be free and to rid themselves of the comparable burdens of absolutist monarchy and feudal privilege. The universalism of the original French Revolution was to be of great importance." However, let it be said, in parenthesis, that although the "Declaration" tried to be universal, it did not set out to be comprehensive, for it failed, as has been pointed out above, to mention certain important fundamental rights.

(iii) *Immediate solution of the financial problem—the confiscation of the Church lands.*—The most acute problem which faced the Constituent Assembly was that of finance. It was this problem which, as we know, had brought that body into existence and had, in a sense, been the immediate cause of the Revolution.

The treasury being empty, the Assembly had to resort to extreme measures to meet the situation. With a view to salvage the state from certain bankruptcy it was resolved that the vast wealth of the Church, valued at several hundred million dollars, taken over by the state. In November 1789, the Church property was confiscated and it became state property without any compensation. Monasteries and religious establishments were suppressed. The question as to whether the Assembly in confiscating this property was violating the rights of property, so clearly proclaimed in the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" perforce became purely academic in the face of the acute financial crisis confronting the nation. The argument of necessity transcended every other consideration.

The Church lands, however, could not be sold quickly as to provide the government with ready cash. But the Assembly soon found a way out of the situation. It decided to issue

notes, really interest-bearing bonds, on the land as security—the *assignats*, as they were called.

Paper money works well so long as too much use of the printing press in producing it is not resorted to. In other words, the production of the paper currency must be kept within reasonable limits. However, the natural temptation of printing more and more paper currency and thereby adding to the revenues to state could not be resisted by the Assembly with the result that by 1791 the paper currency depreciated in value, and inflation was already under way. The process was continued in the succeeding years in an effort to meet wartime expenditure; and, consequently the *assignats* had to be finally repudiated. It was done in 1797.

Nevertheless, the issue of assignats proved to be a financial expedient—it eased the financial stress for the time being, and certainly saved the state from immediate bankruptcy; and made it possible for the Assembly to proceed with constitutional measures for the next two years.

(iv) *The reorganization of the Church*—The confiscation of the Church property brought into its train the problem of making some provision for the clergy who had now no longer any endowment to support themselves. This led in July, 1790, to the framing of the “Civil Constitution of the Clergy”, which sought to regulate the relation of Church and State, and to which all the clergy were later (November 1790) required to take an oath.

All officers of the Church whose number was reduced were now to be paid servants of the state. The clergymen were to receive their salaries in cash. All the secular clergy were to be chosen by popular election, no papal confirmation being required. In short, the Catholic Church was in effect made a department of the state.

As was to be expected, the Pope condemned in no uncertain terms the new regulations and enjoined upon the clergymen in France not to take the oath of allegiance to “Civil Constitution”. The result was that the clergymen in France were divided into two groups. Those who took the oath came to be known as *Juring clergy*, while those who refused to take the oath in response to the call of their conscience were called

Non-juring clergy. It was only a small minority of clergy who took to the oath of allegiance to the "Civil Constitution". Upto that time a large number of clergymen belonging to the lower strata had supported the Revolution but now they adopted hostile attitude towards it. They joined hands with the nobility to bring about a counter Revolution in France. It also started a conflict between Church and State which was long to continue and divide the French people.

(v) *New Administrative System.*—The Constituent Assembly introduced a new uniform system of administration in place of the old system of government by *intendants*, governors and *parliament*. The country was divided afresh into eighty-three departments of uniform size and population. The departments in turn were further divided into cantons and communes. Their administration was entrusted to the elected local bodies which replaced the old government officials appointed by the king.

It must, however, be noted that the re-modelling of the administration made the executive authority weak. The local bodies not only possessed the power of local administration but also exercised some powers which were enjoyed previously by the central government. The crown had no local representative to collect state revenue. It had no means of compelling the local bodies to obey its orders. It was as though eighty-three separate republics had been formed in France and the danger of the country falling assunder was there. The weakening of the central executive authority, let it be emphasised, also paved the way for the local tyrannies of the commune and for the Reign of Terror of 1793.

(vi) *Changes in the Judicial System.* In place of the old judicial system, largely hereditary and self supporting, the Constituent Assembly provided the country with a new system. A high national court was established to try political offenders accused by the Assembly. In criminal cases the trial by jury was introduced. It was an innovation as far as France was concerned. The judges were to be elected by the people and were to hold office for a period from the two to four years, and were to be paid salaries by the government. A uniform

system of law was introduced with a view to unify and simplify different types of law then in operation in the country.

Undoubtedly, some of these measures brought about much improvement in the existing judicial system of the country but there was one conspicuous drawback in the new system. The fact that the judges were to be popularly elected and were to hold office for a short term militated against the independence of judiciary, for the judges under the circumstances could not be expected to be firm and impartial in administering justice.

(vii) *The Constitution of 1791.* Meanwhile, the Assembly was nearing the end of its activities. By September 1791, the constitution was completed and after Louis XVI formally accepted it, became the law of the land. It was the first written constitution of France and was based on the twin principles of the sovereignty of the people and separation of powers. The latter, as we know, was propounded by Montesquieu, and had already been embodied in the American Constitution of 1787.

The King. Under the new constitution the king was to be the constitutional ruler of France. He had no control over the life of the legislature. He could neither prorogue nor dissolve the assembly. He was deprived of all law making powers. He had, however, the right of "suspensive veto" that is, the right to hold up a measure until it had been passed by three assemblies. He was no longer to use the royal treasury as his private property but was to draw a fixed amount (twenty-five million Francs) annually for his expenses.

The Ministers.—The king was still allowed to appoint his ministers but they were excluded from the assembly. They were not allowed to come to the legislature to support or explain their policies. The executive had no authority to control the budget.

The Legislature.—Under the constitution, the legislature was to have the sole right of making laws and levying taxes. It was to consist of a single chamber of 745 members, and was to be elected for a period of only two years. The members were to be elected by "active" citizens who paid certain amount of tax to the government. Only those persons who possessed a certain amount of property were only eligible to

seek election. The legislature was denied control over local administration, National Guards, and armed forces of the state.

The Judiciary.—The constitution introduced sweeping and extensive changes in the judicial system of France. Judges were now to be elected. Their terms of office were to vary from two to four years. The Jury system, so far unknown in France, was introduced in criminal cases.

For the merits and defects of the new constitution, one cannot but refer to the observations made by C. D. Hazen in this connection : "The Constitution of 1791 represented an improvement in French government; yet it did not work well and did not last long. As a first experiment in the art of self-government it had its value, but it revealed inexperience and poor judgment in several points which perpetuated trouble for the future. The executive and the legislature were so sharply separated that communication between them was difficult and suspension was consequently easily fostered. The king might not select his ministers from the legislature ; he might not, in case of a difference of opinion with the legislature, dissolve the latter, as the English king could do, thus allowing the voters to decide between them. The king's veto was not a weapon strong enough to protect him from the attacks of the legislature, yet it was enough to irritate the legislature, if used. The distinction between active and passive citizens was in plain and flagrant defiance of the declaration of the Rights of Man and inevitably created a discontented class. The administrative decentralization was so complete that the efficiency of the national government was gone. France was split up into eighty-three fragments and the coordination of all these units, their direction towards great national ends in response to the will of the nation as a whole, was rendered extremely difficult, and in certain cases, impossible."

Estimate of the Work of the Constituent Assembly—Surveying the work of the Constituent Assembly it may be pointed out that it was a varied bill of fare.

Destructive Work of the Assembly—The Assembly abolished the inequalities and injustices of the *ancien regime*. Its pillars

were demolished. Serfdom, feudal services, tithes to the Church, internal tariffs, guilds, and all the financial and judicial abuses were swept away. Absolutism was done away with.

Constructive Work of the Assembly—The Assembly by inaugurating a new principle the equality before law did yeoman's service to posterity. "The paradise of privilege, haughtiness and limitless expenditure had come to an end". The Assembly by proclaiming a new gospel, that of the personal dignity of the common man, left a heritage for all time and for all the world. In addition, the Assembly by establishing a regime that afforded at least a section of the citizenry participation in public affairs, opened new vistas for the future.

Seamy Side of the Work of Assembly—There is however, the seamy side of the picture. According to D.M. Ketelbey, "It is easy to criticize the work of the Assembly. It left a heritage of problems at home and abroad ; it had destroyed wholesale system of administration ; it had opened the way to mob rule ; it had enunciated dangerous theories ; it had created a religious schism and defied international law ; made the mistake—to a British mind—of divorcing the legislature from the executive and, what was more serious, by its final decree it cut off the new Assembly from the experience of the old one. Much of its work was subsequently undone, but much remained permanent, and it must be remembered that most of its mistakes were committed in fear of the Crown and arose from the corporate and individual insecurity that haunted all its actions".

The Finale—The Constituent Assembly had done a stupendous work it had liquidated feudalism, drawn up the Declaration of the Rights of Man, created a constitution and divided France into new units, the *departments*. It passed as many as twenty-five thousand decrees. On September 30th, 1791 it dissolved itself having accomplished its work. Before doing so, it passed a decree that none of its members should be eligible for the new legislative assembly set up under the

constitution. This was the result of an alliance between republicans and royalists, both of whom disliked the constitution and wished to deprive those who had framed it of their power.

The Legislative Assembly (October 1791—September 1792)

Elections having been held under the constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly some time before its dissolution, the Legislative Assembly met on October 1st, 1791, that is the day after its predecessor was dissolved. Not a day was allowed to intervene without a legislature in session, because it was feared that in case there was an interval, however brief, the court might by some way find the means to regain its lost power.

In view of the self-denying decree passed by the out-going Assembly to the effect that its members were not eligible to seek election to the Legislative Assembly, the new body was perforce, "full of untried men (may be) with plenty of ideas and an abundance of eloquence, but new to experience and new to glory". In the new body, there was a preponderance of lawyers, many of whom had won a local reputation for revolutionary ardour and were ambitious to play a part on a large stage. In short, "it was a new generation of young revolutionaries dazzled by dreams of unprecedented opportunities and lured by the glamour of Paris" that crowded into the new Assembly.

Character of the Legislative Assembly

As a result of the elections, out of a total of 745 members of the house, some 265 were Feuillants, while about 135 were republicans, chiefly Cordeliers, Girondians (or Girondists) and Jacobins. The rest were independents.

Strangely enough, the Feuillants—the champions of the preservation of the constitution—who sat on the right in this Assembly had been the radicals of the Constituent Assembly. It was an evidence of the downward course of the Revolution. The majority sitting in the centre, were not committed to any group and likely to be swayed by the oratory of the moment.

On the extreme left, sat the Cordeliers, Girondins, and Jacobins. The Cordeliers constituted a group led by such men as Danton, which avowedly favoured the dethronement of the king and the establishment of a republic. The Jacobins so called from their meeting in the hall of the Jacobin convent, had the support of the mob in Paris. The Girondins, so called because their earliest leaders, Vergniaud, Guadet etc. were deputies for the Gironde department in south west France comprised young journalists and lawyers who gloried in the watchword "Liberty, equality, fraternity". They were doctrinaires, disciples of the philosophic movement, apostles of *laissez faire*, and enemies of the Church. It was they who determined that foreign war would be the salvation of revolutionary France.

The Girondins Bent on Pulling Down the "Bourgeois Monarchy"

Despite their small number in the Assembly, the Girondins came to dominate it. It was chiefly because of the gift of the gab of their leaders, who swayed the house by their eloquence and oratory, The Girondins were bent upon destroying the *ancien regime*, root and branch. And what of the *ancien regime* was still left, save the "Bourgeois Monarchy"? They set about pulling down this, the only remanent of the regime by embarking upon "a bold and ingenious policy of provocation" which succeeded eminently in the long run. They passed decrees against the *emigre* nobles and the non-juring priests denouncing them in no uncertain terms (and with ample justification) "as formenters of disturbance and friends of the King".

Decrees Against the Emigre Nobles

Quite a number of nobles, including the King's younger brother, the Count of Artois, scurried out of the country after the fall of the Bastille (July 14th, 1789)—the first of many emigrations of nobles. "The rats are leaving the sinking ship" so was this action described. The Count of Artois was also joined his eldest brother, the Count of Provence. Both these

brothers assumed the leadership of the *emigres*—a term used to denote royalty and nobles who quitted France during the Revolution. They organised an army of 20,000 strong across the Rhine at Colbenz. They also requested the rulers of Austria and Prussia for help to undo the Revolution. Their aim was to get back for the King his former absolute powers, and for the nobles their old privileges. On August 27, 1791, the Emperor Leopold of Austria, (brother of French Queen, Marie Antoinette) and the King of Prussia met at Phillnitz and made a joint declaration to the effect that French affairs were the common interest of all Europe and asserted their willingness to intervene to protect Louis XVI if other rulers would join them : but this was intended to be no more than a gesture for they knew that the other powers would not support them. The declaration of Phillnitz was, however, regarded as an insult to the French nation.

The legislative Assembly, in the face of these developments, passed two decrees against the *emigres*. One of the decrees required the Count of Provence to return to France immediately on pain of being deprived of the throne of France. The other threw a stern warning to the *emigres* that if they failed to return to France by January 1, 1792 they would be treated as traitors, and, if caught, would be punished with death and their property seized. The King, although he had little reason to love the *emigres* whose intrigues had embarrassed him both at home and abroad, could not be a party to a sentence of death against them. He therefore, vetoed the decrees passed by the Assembly.

Decrees against the Non-juring Priests—The non-juring clergy exploited the innocent masses who were orthodox by nature and for their selfish ends incited them against the government. In many places situation was getting out of control and a civil war appeared imminent. The Legislative Assembly could not possibly shut its eyes to these ominous developments, and on November 29th, 1791 passed decrees to the effect that if the non-juring clergy did not relent and did not take the oath within a week to the "Civil Constitution" they would be deprived of their salaries from the state, and what was worse, would be considered as suspects.

The king on his part was touched by his conscience on this issue, and exercised his veto power with the result that the decrees against non-juring priests never became a law.

This was exactly what the Girondins desired and had anticipated. By vetoing both sets of decrees against the *emigre* nobles and the non-juring priests "the King stood self-revealed as the enemy of the Revolution and in league with traitors, and what popularity was left to him began rapidly lobb away".

The Girondins and the War Issue

The Girondins, determined to ruin the monarchy beyond a hope of redemption, wanted to go still further ; they wished to make a traitor of the King himself and found a lever for that purpose in the issue of a foreign war.

Origins of the war—The origins of the war which France declared against Europe on April 20th, 1792, are to be found in a situation which increasingly favoured its outbreak. Let us examine that situation in some detail.

The revolutionaries of France were not contented with the spread of their ideas only in their own country. They were determined to propagate their ideas in other countries of Europe also. "Revolutionary democracy was a new creed based on a new philosophy and a new theory of ethics, and, like a new religion, could be preached throughout the world". The constituent Assembly had resolutely refused to have a foreign policy, the Legislative Assembly as resolutely determined to have a vigorous one, and to turn a political faith into a fighting force, which like Islam, should make political and spiritual conquests at one and the same time. The cause of France became the "cause of all peoples all against kings". It is no wonder, therefore, that under the circumstances all the rulers of other countries found themselves compelled to take effective measures to check the onslaught of the "hydraheaded monster" (as they considered the Revolution to be) on their own countries. Consequently, there was a strong possibility bordering on certainty that they would intervene in the affairs of France to nip the "evil" at its source. In France there was therefore an increasing fear of an invasion by foreign armies, assisted

by the *emigres* and supported by a royalist rising inside the country which led many among the supporters of the republican clubs in France to think of a preventive war in anticipation of the attack. In other words, their thinking was that France should protect herself by attacking her enemies. At the same time, the republican clubs in Paris were welcoming political refugees from abroad, particularly the Austrian Netherlands, who persistently urged the French to intervene in their own countries where they said the people were anxiously awaiting the opportunity to revolt against their despotic rulers and join the revolutionary France. Such an idea appealed to the crusading spirit of the French revolutionaries. The possibility of war with Austria, in particular, was therefore not unpopular with many French people, who resented both the Austrian alliance and the half-century of French humiliation in foreign affairs.

The War Hysteria

The Girondins set out activity to bring about war. Their motives were varied. They calculated that war would rally popular support behind themselves as republicans, so enabling them to achieve power and secure their political aims. Apart from strictly personal interest they favoured war for another, two reasons. They saw in the war a means of spreading the notion of liberty as also of forcing the King into the open. They reasoned that if he was forced to declare war on his brother monarchs and break with his former friends, the *emigres*, it would not be long before they would convict him of the treachery they suspected.

Strangely enough, the Feuillants were also for war, though for opposite reasons from that of the Girondins, namely the hope of strengthening the monarchy. Only Robespierre and certain other Jacobins outside the Assembly opposed war, as in their opinion, it would increase the misery of the poor and postpone internal reforms. "The thing for us to do" declared Robespierre at the Jacobin Club, "is to set our own affairs in order and to acquire liberty for ourselves before offering it to others." But in the Assembly the great majority were swept into war hysteria by the oratory of the Girondins, and

when a declaration of war was moved in the Assembly, only a very small number of deputies cast their votes against it. On April 20th, 1792, the King formally declared war against the Austrian Emperor—incidentally the Queen's nephew.

Declaration of War (April 20, 1792)

Thus began "a spirit of lightheartedness and frenzied enthusiasm" a conflict with Europe and later with Britain also that was to last for twenty-three long years, from 1792 to 1815, leading France through strange vicissitudes of fortune—"Terror", "Military Despotism", "Waterloo". The more immediate sequel was the downfall of monarchy in France so ardently wished and planned by the Girondins.

Initial Reverses of France in the War

The war began rather badly for France. As hostilities had become likely, an Austro-Prussian alliance had been made in the preceding February, and now Prussia immediately joined her ally. The Legislative Assembly had made no preparations for the war so France was defeated on all fronts in the beginning. Her attack on Belgium ended in a smoke.

Hopes rested upon the War.—The Girondian hopes that the declaration of war by France would be a sign of a general rising by the people of neighbouring countries in her favour were falsified. Equally falsified were the hopes of Marie Antoinette that the monarchy would now be saved by foreign intervention "*Tant Mieux*" (So much the better), the Queen had written at the outset of war. Rather the hopes of the republicans that the war would even further discredit the monarchy were soon fulfilled. The early French disasters in the war produced an immediate popular reaction in Paris. In June, a crowd of about eight thousand, singing the new revolutionary song, invaded the Tuileries and penetrated into the royal apartments, forcing Louis XVI to drink to the health of the nation and wear a red cap of liberty. Finally, the rabble dispersed but never before had a king been treated with such indignity. As a contemporary remarked: "The throne was still standing, but the people had seated themselves

upon it." The episode is important as making the beginning of nearly a year of virtual anarchy in which all the public authorities were subjected to the caprices of the Paris mob.

Things Heading towards a Crisis—Orators and agitators now attributed the initial reverses of the French forces not to the lack of preparation of the nation but to the treachery of the court. It was propagated that France had been betrayed by the court. Among the most prominent of these orators and agitators was now Danton, one of the founders of the Cordelier Club. He persistantly denounced the monarchy as the cause of the French discomfiture in earlier stages of the war.

Things were heading towards a crisis. On the one side, an undernourished populace was ready to be led to any work of destruction. On the other, the menace of invasion hung heavily over the land, and on July 11th, the Assembly declared the country in danger, all national guards being called to arms. On the 13th, the contingent from Marseilles marched into Paris, singing the song that was to become the anthem of the Revolution, the *Marseillaise*. Paris went wild with excitement.

The materials for explosion had thus been piled, it was the Brunswick Manifesto, the handiwork of an *smigre*, that finally brought it about. This proclamation *issued* in the name of the Emperor of Austria and King of Prussia by the Duke of Brunswick on July 26th, stated that his purpose was "to restore the King to safety and liberty of which he had been deprived and enable him to exercise his legitimate authority," and threatened, if any violence were offered to the royal family, to exact "an exemplary and never-to-be forgotten vengeance by delivering up Paris to military execution and complete destruction". Nothing could have been more calculated to goad the Paris populace to fury.

The taking of the Tuileries and the fall of the Monarchy.—Danton and the revolutionary politicians were now ready for action. On the morning of August 10th, the forces controlled by the Republican Clubs forcibly seized the Hotel de Ville in Paris, ejected the members of the Commune by force, and set up a new, insurrectionary Commune of Paris which had already been chosen. Then the forces were directed to march

on the Tuileries. They massacred the Swiss guards and sacked the palace. Warned in time the King with his family took refuge with the Legislative Assembly huddled in a stenographer's box.

The Legislative Assembly had clearly lost control of events and had to reckon with the new situation. It suspended the King from his functions instead of deposing him, but the new commune insisted upon his imprisonment along with his family in the old fortified monastery of the Temple, where he and his family awaited their tragic end. At last the throne had fallen. And along with monarchy had ended the privileged position of the *bourgeois i.e.*, for the commune induced the Assembly to order the election on a fresh basis of universal manhood suffrage of a new body, the Convention, which was to decide on a future form of government in France. The demand had been made by Robespierre even before the episode of August 10th, and the Girondins whose strength lay in the departments, were not averse to such a step.

The "September Massacres"

On August 29th, 1792, that is nine days after the fall of the monarchy, the combined armies of Austria and Prussia invaded France, and within a fortnight they entered Lorraine, took Lunenburg, and on September 2nd, captured Verdun, the last stronghold before Paris. Fear and frenzy gripped the city.

Appearing before the Assembly Danton electrified his countrymen by exhorting them "*de l'audace, encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace.*" ("To dare, still to dare, and ever to dare") to save France. Jean-Paul Marat (1743-93) urged the punishment of all traitors and counter-revolutionaries to whom was ascribed the present misfortune of France. Treason was the cry of the day, treason in the court, treason in every house. In consequence the Assembly had yielded to the popular demand of arresting aristocrats and suspects, friends of the king, friends of the enemy, priests, and relatives of the *emigres*, and those who had not approved of the incidents of August 10th. Soon rumours were afloat that these persons

behind the bars whose number ran into several thousands were plotting the break out and sieze of the city. The populace was agog, and frantic mobs broke into the prisons of Paris, dragged out the inmates, set up improvised tribunals which sentenced the prisoners, and handed them to be murdered in cold blood by groups of killers. Altogether about 1600 men were put to death, sometimes under circumstances of the foulest savagery. The provinces too took their cue from 'the capital'.

It was a proof of the anarchy that existed ; no authority, national or municipal, tried to stop the hideous outrage. It is also an evidence of the excesses which a frantic mob will stoop in time of excitement and when power is in its hands.

It was in this tense atmosphere that the elections to the Convention held on the basis of universal manhood suffrage as decreed by outgoing Legislative Assembly, and the convention met on September 21st 1792.

The War took a Sudden Turn in Favour of France

The fourtune of war suddenly changed a day before the Convention first met. At the cannonade of Valmy in the Argonne on September 20th the French held their own and halted the Prussian advance, and the Duke of Brunswick's forces, hampered bp heavy rains, by difficulties of supply, and by the ravages of dysentery, were ordered to withdraw. Revolutionary France was thus providentially saved from a catastrophic defeat which stared her in the face.

"Valmy" was not a great battle but became a landmark because it put heart into the despairing French, and started the astonishing succession of victories which France was to win for the next twenty years.

"Valmy" thus in Goethe's famous phrase heralded a new world. It saved the Revolutionary France from being crushed in 1792.

The Convention (September 1792 —October 1795)

Since the elections to the Convention were held during the terrible days of the "September massacres", hardly ten per

cent of the electorate exercised their right of vote. The great majority of citizens kept away from the elections due to fear as well as perhaps to weariness of the Revolution. Of the 750 members declared elected to the new body, a third had formerly sat in either the Constituent Assembly or the Legislative Assembly. Two-third of the members were new faces in the house. The Girondins were now the largest party. They sat on the right (the conservative right) of the Assembly. The Jacobin's called at the time "Mountaineers" from the high seats they occupied at the back of the hall, sat on left. The majority of the deputies were called the "Plain" as they did not belong to either faction though they usually supported the Girondins.

Work of the Convention

As C.J.H. Hayes observes, "Perhaps no legislative body in history has been called upon to solve such knotty problems as those which confronted the National Convention at the beginning of the session." The important problems which faced the new body can be enumerated. Something had to be done with the "suspended" King; the country had to be saved from foreign invasion; internal insurrection had to be suppressed; a government had to be established, social reforms had to be completed and consolidated; a new constitution had to be framed for the country.

Let us now examine the accomplishments of the convention

(i) Execution of Louis XVI (January 21st 1793)

Though without any constitutional right to do so, the Convention constituted itself a jury and tried the "suspended" King. He was allowed the privilege of counsel. As the voting in the case was oral, and in the presence of galleries packed with an unruly and vociferous mob, the outcome was never in doubt. The King was pronounced guilty of conspiracy though the Convention had no actual proof of the guilt. It may be observed that it was not a moral question at all, but solely personal and political. When it came to fixing the sentence the Girondins were hopelessly divided, and this,

it turned out, proved fatal to the King who was condemned to immediate execution by a bare majority of one—in a house, as we know, elected by not more than ten per cent of the citizens of France. Let it be emphasized that the King's execution under the circumstances was by no means the expressed will of the nation. The real reason why Louis was guillotined was the fear that the presence of the King was dangerous to the country.

It was the will of the Jacobins that prevailed. The Girondins, not wanting to kill the King, could not avert the impending sentence, because of the division in their ranks. The Convention could not dare to stand in the way of the execution. As a contemporary observed, "It required more courage to absolve than to condemn." On Sunday, January 21st 1793, Louis XVI then nicknamed Louis Capet, "martyr to an outworn faith and his own ineffectual goodwill" was executed by the guillotine, an instrument named after Joseph Ignace Guillotin (1788-1814), a physician who had secured its adoption the previous spring as a painless means of decapitation.

A good-for-nothing fellow during his life-time, Louis XVI won general admiration by the stoical way he met his end. His last words were : "sirs, I am innocent of that which I am accused. I hope my blood will consolidate the happiness of all French men". Marie Antoinette met the same fate in the following October after being subjected to every indignity and insult while in prison.

(ii) Military successes in the Revolutionary War

Entry of Britain into the War (1793).—At the cannonade of Valmy (September 20th, 1792), French held their own and the Duke Brunswick's forces withdrew to the frontier. The French though they had achieved no great military success, took heart, and now proceeded with a number of "diversions". They occupied and annexed Nice and Savoy in Italy. They attacked the ecclesiastical states of the Rhineland and took Mainz and Frankfurt. On November 6th by their victory at Jampasses, they became masters of Belgium. They entered

Brussels on the 14th. Two days later they contravened international treaties and struck a blow at the Dutch by declaring the Scheldt an open river. On the 19th they promised their assistance to all foreign peoples who might wish to recover their liberty. On December 15th the French generals were ordered to proclaim, wherever they went, the 'sovereignty of the people' and to suppress existing authorities and overthrow the feudal order. It was these decrees, and the threat to Holland, which drew Britain into the war. Her indignation had been growing from the time of "September massacres" and the execution of Louis XVI intensified her anger. War was quickly accepted as inevitable in Britain.

Extension of War to Most of Europe

But Pitt broke with France on diplomatic issues, and steadfastly refused in the following years to make the war an ideological one. It was in fact France which declared war on Britain and Holland on February 1st 1792. On March 7th she declared war also against Spain, and other states were soon involved. Thus in the Spring of 1793, France found herself at war with the greater portion of Europe—Britain, Austria, Prussia, Holland, Spain, Sardinia—which constituted the First Coalition.

France in a Quandry

This rapid extension of war to most of Europe, including Britain, was soon accompanied by French reverses. The French armies in the east were driven back to the Rhine. Dumouriez who should have invaded Holland was defeated at Neerwinden (March 18), and retreated to the frontiers where he negotiated with the Austrians. Again France was threatened with invasion.

Inside France too serious trouble was brewing. Early in March a dangerous counter-Revolution rebellion had broken out among the peasants of La Vendee which seemed to presage a formidable civil war. To further add to the troubles, the *assignats*, the paper money issued on the security of confiscated

lands, had depreciated and France was faced with financial collapse and a shortage of food.

Jacobins in Power.—These depressing events, perforce, had wide repercussions on the course of the Revolution because they brought to an end the power of the Girondins, having been discredited by the reverses suffered by the country. The Jacobins, the advocates of direct democracy, and most ardent champions of vigorous national defence against the forces of counter revolution, now came into the forefront. Their leader, Maximilien Robespierre, an extraordinary man in many ways, personified the Jacobin revolutionary impulses. He stood for all that Jacobinism stands for. From July 1793, when he became a member of the Committee of Public Safety of the Convention until July 1794, when he died on the guillotine, he was virtually dictator of France.

The Reign of Terror (July 1793—July 1794)

The why and wherefore of the 'Terror' Robespierre clearly perceived that only by establishing dictatorship could civil war be ended, unity resorted, and the country put in a condition to defend itself against the enemy knocking at its doors. It was no light thing for France, torn by revolution and anarchy, to fight most of Europe. The French nation must put itself heart and soul into the task. But since patriotism was not an easy sentiment to cultivate during the dark hours of set backs both abroad and at home, and since, in any case, there were large elements of the population, either actually disloyal, or at least unwilling to discipline themselves to follow the government's lead, it was deemed necessary to back this despotism by "Terror". If men would not serve from love or loyalty they must be made to serve from fear ; hence the machinery of capital punishment which the Government had at its hand to destroy all elements of opposition, all traitors, not only actual but potential, and which could be used as kind of whip brandished over the heads of the French nation. This will partly explain the regularity of the executions—daily warnings of what might happen to any person who was not true. In short

the 'Terror' was an emergency despotism—a "dictatorship of distress".

It cannot be denied, however, that there were many persons unjustly killed, many persons who suffered merely for belonging to a certain class or an insufficient evidence of treason. Yet, it is difficult to see how without the 'Terror' France could have pulled herself out of the morass in which she found herself in the spring of 1793, and mobilized the strength to beat back the enemy.

After all is said and done, the 'Terror' did stand France in good stead. It saved France at a critical juncture.

Machinery of the 'Terror'

On March 9th was formed that Revolutionary Tribunal which proved to be the great instrument of the 'Terror'. On April 6th, was established the Committee of Public Safety which was indeed its corner stone. Then there were the 'Deputies on Mission'—members of the Convention chosen by two's go to every department and every army in the field. They were the long arm of the government, invested with power to enforce loyalty in the country and at the front. They wielded despotic power.

Operation of the 'Terror'

The 'Terror' was made possible by the passing of the Law of Suspects (September 17th 1793), which allowed arrest and imprisonment without any proof of guilt. All over France, men and women were thrown into prison, usually to face summary trial and execution. The victims were priests, noblemen, ladies of high birth, and also republican opponents of the men in power, and unsuccessful revolutionary generals. In fact, of those guillotined eighty-five per cent belonged to the third estate, some 6.5 per cent to the clergy, and 8.5 per cent to the nobility. Among them was Madame Roland (1734—93), one of the organisers of the Girondin Club. She on her way to the scaffold bitterly remarked: "Liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name". In October the woman she had hated, Marie Antoinette, also went to the guillotine.

The La Vendean revolt was put down with ruthless severity, a particularly brutal deputy having been given the supervision

of the work, which resulted in the burning of villages and the butchery of some two thousand people. The great majority of execution occurred in those western, southern, and eastern frontier districts directly affected by war and the civil war.

An Estimate of the Casualties

In Paris the Revolutionary Tribunal controlled the 'Terror' with more moderation than in some places in the provinces, where the "Deputies on Mission" committed such excess as the butchering of over 4,000 in four months at Nantes, some by drowning through the deliberate sinking of boat, and the mass shooting by volleys of gunfire of 2,000 at Lyons. During the months of the 'Terror', 16,594 people are known to have been executed, 2639 in Paris; and Donald Greer in a recent statistical survey has concluded: "It is probable that between 35,000 and 40,000 persons, including those who succumbed in the prisons and those killed without any form of trial, lost their lives".

The 'Terror', though it took a very heavy toll of life, brought about unity in the country, treachery and indiscipline having been stamped out ruthlessly.*

Revolutionary France triumphant

It was the military situation which was largely responsible for the organization of the 'Terror'. The Government adopted a number of stern measures to bring about sweeping change in the organization of the armed forces. These measures not only saved the country from defeat, but revolutionized contem-

*By July 1794, it was felt that there was no justification for continuing the 'Terror' because the "Allies" had already been beaten back. There was a general desire to end the horror of tribunals, guillotines, drownings and fusillades. The Convention, led by members of the Committee of Public Safety who were themselves doomed, rose up against Robespierre and with ninety-two of his followers, he was guillotined on the Ninth of Thermidor (July 28, 1794). Thermidor was the eleventh month of French Revolutionary Calendar, July 19—August 17. The reaction which followed the Reign of Terror is historically known as the Thermidorean Reaction. Thermidorean has come to mean participator in the fall of Robespierre on the 9th Thermidor.

The fall of Robespierre also marked the end of the 'Terror'.

porary warfare. The Government passed a law of compulsory military training and introduced the principle of universal conscription for military service, though at first only bachelors and childless widowers between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five were called up.

Under the able guidance of Lazarre Carnot (1753—1823), a member of the Committee of Public Safety, an efficient, well trained and well-disciplined national army of over 700,000 soldiers was raised. Never in modern history had one nation mobilized so large a fighting force. What was still more important, Carnot infused in the army a new spirit of fighting for the cause of the French Revolution. He gave a call to the youth of the country to fight against the enemy with ferocity, fanaticism and tenacity. Thus a new kind of army transported with revolutionary *elan* (dash) was created which changed the manner of war as fought by the older professional armies. It was the introduction of those measures that made possible first the victories of the French armies and then the military dictatorship of Napoleon.

When we remember the condition of the French army at the outset of the war, the transformation which took place seems almost a miracle—a marvellous proof, certainly, of the vitality of the French nation. The French soldier was now something more than a conscript; he realized that he was fighting for a France that belonged to *him*—the France of the Revolution. No greater effusion of patriotism has been shown than this patriotism of the 'Terror', with its two-fold basis, defence of country and defence of the Revolution. Going into battle, singing the *Marseillaise*, the French armies were irresistible.

In view of the new unity, spirit, efficiency and military strength acquired by France the war before long turned very much in her favour, and Carnot who had formerly been given the title of "Organizer of Defence" now came to be called "Organizer of Victory". The "proud and formidable Allies", on their part, suffered a series of disasters and reverses which may briefly be indicated. In the autumn of 1793 the French relieved Dunkirk, forced the British to leave Toulon and pushed back the Austrians and Prussians. The next year they drove the Spanish back across the Pyrenees and invaded

Catalonia. Soon afterwards, they overran the Austrian Netherlands in the winter advanced into Holland, defeating her on land and capturing the fleet. Holland was then formed into the Batavian Republic under the French protection.

Prussia was by now financially bankrupt and her relations with Austria were strained. Hence she left the Coalition and signed the Treaty of Basel with France in April 1795, by which France was to remain in occupation of the left bank of the Rhine and in secret clauses undertook to compensate Prussia for the loss of this territory at the expense of other German states. In July, Spain also withdrew from the Coalition, surrendering island of San Domingo to France, and the next year made alliance with France.

In short, by October 1795, of the members of the First Coalition, only Britain, Austria and Sardinia remained at war with France.

(iii) Introduction of social, economic and political reforms

The Convention with a view to consolidating and strengthening the Revolution introduced sweeping reforms in the country. They may be summarized as follows :

(a) The work of codification of the national laws of the country was taken in hand and much headway was made in that direction. It was provided that there was to be no imprisonment for debt, and no negro slavery in the French Colonies. Women to have their right to property. All children were to have equal share in the property of their father. A new and uniform system of weights and measures called the metric system was introduced in the country.

(b) The Convention launched experiments in the socialist sphere. The property of the *emigres* was confiscated. Persons of wealth, clergymen and nobles were all treated as suspects. The "suspected persons" were compelled to "subscribe to a compulsory loan" in proportion to their taxable wealth. Large landed estates were broken up and offered for sale in bits on easy instalment terms to enable the ordinary people to own their own land. Thus a large number of peasant-proprietors were created. No compensation was to be given to those who were deprived of their lands. As Jean-Paul Marat (1743-93)

aptly put it "the rich have so long sucked out the marrow of the people that they are now visited with a crushing retribution". "The laws of the maximum" were passed which fixed the prices of grain and other necessities of life as also of the rates of wages. All distinctions of high and low-born were to disappear. No one was to be addressed as "Monsieur", rather every one was to be addressed as Citizen". The use of silk stockings and knee breaches—a privilege of the aristocracy was forbidden, and every one was to put on long trousers.

The Convention thus sought to bring out a complete transformation of society and to make the Revolutionary regime as a species of totalitarianism.

(c) The Convention also attempted experiments in the field of religion. It showed unmitigated hostility towards the traditional form of Christianity and made efforts to de-Christianise France. Churches were transformed into temples of reason. Under the auspices of the Paris Commune the atheistic "religion of reason" was inaugurated in the Cathedral of Notre Dame (Virgin Mary) at Paris in July 1794. The deistic cult (cult which believes in the existence of God, but not in a revealed religion) of the Supreme Being was also introduced. However, at the fall of Robespierre in July 1794, the Convention retraced its steps and took up the attitude that religion was a private affair and it was no business of the state either to establish or to maintain an official religion, with the result that religious toleration was given to all, and many Church buildings were restored for Christian worship in 1795.

(d) The Convention also introduced a new republican calendar according to which the year was divided into twelve months named after the appropriate weather or crops.* Each month was to be of three weeks of ten days each. Every tenth day was declared a holiday. The five or six days left over at the end of the year were to be observed as national holidays.

*The names of the months from September to August were Vendémiaire, Brumaire, Frimaire, Nivose, Pluviose, Ventose, Germinal, Floreal, Prairial, Messidor, Thermidor and Fructidor. The contemporary English translation of those names was Wheezy, Sneezy, Freezy, Slipply, Drippy, Nippy, Showery, Flowery, Bowery, Wheaty, Heaty and Sweety.

The new calendar was to date from September 23rd 1792—being the date of the proclamation of the Republic. The republican calendar, however, was widely ignored by the French people and its use was mainly restricted to official announcements and legal documents : it was abolished in 1804 shortly after the establishment of the Empire.

The fact should not be overlooked that the introduction of the new calendar, like the proclamation of the new “Cult of Reason” was a campaign of de-christianisation.

(e) An achievement of the Convention was the establishment of the Normal School, the Polytechnic School, the Museum of the Louvre, the National Library and the *Institute de France*. Some of these institutions became world renowned..

(iv) Constitution of the First Republic in France

During the last year of its existence the Convention had passed on to the *bourgeoise* control, and it was during this period that the Republican Constitution, the so-called constitution of the year III, was framed and promulgated during the summer of 1795. The document consequently came to have a *bourgeoise* tinge in it. Universal suffrage granted in 1792 was given up again in 1795. Right of vote was given to property holders.

A two-chambered legislature (the Council of Ancients and the Council of Five Hundred) was instituted. The Council of Ancients (*Council des Anciens*) was to consist of 250 members. Its members were to be at least forty years of age, and were to be either married or widowers. The Council of five Hundred was to be the lower House and its members were to be over thirty years of age. The Lower House was to propose all laws but they could only be effective if agreed to by the Council of Ancients. Every year a third of each Council was to retire in favour of new members but two-thirds of their first members were to be come from the existing Convention. The Deputies were to be chosen by electors nominated by the primary assemblies which consisted of all citizens over twenty-one and paying a direct tax. Elections to both the Councils were thus indirect.

The executive authority under the constitution was not entrusted to one man ; rather it was vested in a Directory of five persons, one of whom was to retire every five years. Each Director was to be elected by the Councils and was to be at least forty years of age. The Directory had no initiative in legislation, and was on the whole rather weak organ. There were to be resident commissioners in each province appointed by the central government to see to the enforcement of the laws, though the local authorities continued to be elective. The constitution came into force on October 26th 1795, when the Convention was to be dissolved, and lasted until November, 1799.*

Observations on the Constitution

Abandoning the draft constitutions of both the Girondins and the Jacobins, the Convention drew up a third, which betrayed not only fear of the executive but also fear of the mob. It began with a declaration of duties as well as of rights.

The framers of the constitution ignored the practical value of executive leadership resting on legislative support. The administration of the country at large under this constitution was to compromise between the centralization of the Old Regime and the decentralization of the constitutional monarchy. In its electoral requirements and its weak executive the new constitution resembled the constitutional monarchy. The new constitution, like that of 1791, also put political power into the hands of the middle class. There was, however, marked difference, in as much as in 1791 there was a *bourgeois* monarchy ; while in 1795 there was a *bourgeois* republic.

The new republican experiment which is commonly known as the "Directory" probably well expressed the national desire for an order stable enough to preclude any violent changes. Besides the electoral arrangements and a bicameral legislature, the framers of the constitution took the further precaution of

*The four years, 1795-1799, during which the Directory held the reins in France under new constitution should be viewed as an interim period between the Revolution and the rise of Napoleon.

decreeing that two-thirds of the first members of the legislature were to come from the existing Convention to guard against a royalist reaction, since most of this body were regicides (men who had voted for King's death). The "Thermidorians" had always the problem of pursuing, a middle course, proof against radicalism on the left and royalism on the right. "But the policy of 'middle-grounders' is always a difficult one, since their policy is apt to be negative ; and this was one of the essential weaknesses of the new regime."

Impact of the French Revolution

In common with all revolutions, the significance of the French Revolution could be perceived only with the lapse of time. In 1815, when the great storm had spent itself, it might appear that especially in Europe outside of France few changes had taken place, and that the social and political structure was still more or less the same as it had been prior to the outbreak of the Revolution. But this was a superficial and, therefore incorrect reading of the situation. If we probe a little beneath the surface, we would perceive that "the principles of the Revolution had displayed their dynamic force in so memorable a fashion that the generation which had witnessed this demonstration was only too well aware that those principles must signify an eternal challenge". It is tantamount to saying that certain forces were let loose by the Revolution and that they could not be more than momentarily contained. The Revolution had called general attention to certain basic human rights and aspirations of human beings which could not possibly be set at naught in future. In one word, the Revolution left a heritage of progress for generations to come.

Let us now examine the nature of that heritage.

The Effects of the Revolution

The effects of the Revolution were not confined to France alone. Its impact having been felt throughout Europe including Britain, all those lands were affected by it, though with different degrees of intensity. But France being the country where it broke out naturally felt its deepest imprint.

In France

Political Effects—The ideals of the French Revolution—*Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite* (Liberty, Equality, Fraternity,—entered into the consciousness of the French people, and there they remained even after the storm had blown over.

Whatever type of Government France might have in future, one thing had now become certain, namely, that she would have a precise description of the government power—in other words a written constitution. “The precision which had marked the thought of the philosophers, and which had displayed itself so often in constitutional experiments, had found a definite anchorage”. No longer was monarchy absolute in theory and this fact was displayed on paper. There is no doubt that only a measure of political liberty was actually enjoyed under the restored Bourbon monarchy in France after the final overthrow of Napoleon. Some wealthy middle classes were only included in the suffrage, and they too did not probably enjoy the dominant political influence. There was no freedom of press, speech, or association either. The significant fact, however, remains that Louis XVIII had to issue a Constitutional Charter embodying certain liberal ideals at his accession in 1814. On paper at least the restored monarchy was in form a constitutional, parliamentary regime, designed to safeguard individual rights.

It should be borne in mind that the Revolution left a legacy of a liberal tradition, which was bound to bear fruit in course of time. There was a reactionary trend known as “romanticism”, among certain intellectuals, no doubt but, it was more of a literary than of a political significance.

Another achievement of the Revolution was that it inculcated the spirit of nationalism among Frenchmen. In fact, one might say with G.P. Gooch that “Nationalism is a child of the French Revolution”. As the historian of the French Revolutionary diplomacy, Albert Sorel, observed, : “The great mass of Frenchmen saw something very practical and real in the Revolution, the abolition of the feudal regime...they saw in the armed emigration an attempt to re-establish by force this hateful regime. The Revolution was being accomplished

to assure Frenchmen free possession of the soil of France. The foreign invasion was taking place to destroy the Revolution, dismember France and subjugate Frenchmen. This quite naturally identified love of France with love of the Revolution". The call given under the circumstances on July 11th 1792, that "Fatherland is in danger" had an instantaneous effect. There was an outburst of intense sentiment of nationalism which inspired France to resist her enemies and beat them back.

The idea of a mass army, involving military service as a civic obligation, was another legacy of the Revolution. A sense of responsibility for the defence of France was now felt by every citizen. A sort of militarism took birth in France.

Still another gift of the Revolution supplemented by the work of Napoleon was uniformity of institutions for France. The country was at last a unified political and economic unit, was a common and efficient administrative system. Besides, France now had a unified body of law, a uniform metric system, and an absence of economic barriers within.

In France there was no longer any privileged class with the result that there was now an equitable system of taxation. Gone were the days when only the common people had to pay taxes.

Economic Effects

Many of the large estates were broken up and relieved of feudal burdens during the Revolution, and the peasants were converted into free proprietors. But still holdings of land tended to be quite large and the law requiring division of inheritances—one of the Revolutionary enactments—led to some subsequent diminution. Besides, many members of the middle-class society were able to acquire estates and this led to further distribution of land. During the Revolution the Guilds more or less ceased to exist with the result that any person could now open a shop and ply any trade according to his inclination without any let or hinderance. A few guilds continued to exist, no doubt, for some decades after the Revolution, but having no special privileges they were as good as extinct.

Religious and Social Effects

An important result of the Revolution was that religious freedom was accorded to all. It was a signal triumph for rationalism. Though the Catholic Church was declared the state religion and as such enjoyed a financially privileged position, "the members of every other cult, or of no cult at all, had an equal right to believe as they chose and to demonstrate that belief or not as they pleased". Still another product of the Revolution to be ascribed to the influence of rationalism was the ending of all those inhuman features of the criminal law in France ; and no one was any longer subjected to arbitrary justice. No doubt, "privilege" was not ended entirely and suffrage was still restricted, but a fundamental change had nevertheless been brought about by abolishing the old unjust social order. Henceforth all were equal before the law. Opportunity was now thrown up to everybody and no more restricted to the accident of birth.

In Europe as a whole

The rulers of the countries of Europe outside of France were neither shocked nor, at first, alarmed by the French Revolution ; revolts were misfortunes to which states were liable, and they looked only for the effects of the Revolution on the balance of power. They saw in the weakness of the monarchy in France the impending dissolution of a hitherto powerful neighbour, and they consequently turned with greater sense of security to their mutual rivalries and their own national ambitions. But they were soon to be disillusioned. As far as the people in those countries were concerned, they were greatly impressed by the example of what the people of France had achieved in knocking down the pride and privilege of the aristocracy which held them by the throat, and the lesson was not to be lost on future generations in those countries.

By and large, the following effects of the French Revolution were discernible in Europe as a whole.

Feudalism was abolished in the states of southern Germany along the Rhine, and in the kingdom of Naples, giving way to

civic equality. Much time, however, had to pass before feudalism was abolished in other states also. But a big stride towards its abolition in Europe was certainly taken as a result of the French Revolution. Besides, many states of Europe after the fashion of France introduced religious toleration, thus ending religious bigotry in greater part of Europe. A better system of administration was in evidence in many states of Europe. As an eminent historian has aptly put it "No country that had been touched by French influence became ever again quite what it had been before."

Though the political, economic, and intellectual developments which made the emergence of nationalism possible were taking place in the past in different countries of Europe, the French Revolution worked as a catalytic agent for the birth of nationalism in western Europe, and it, became a factor to be reckoned with. It must be borne in mind that the French Revolution considerably contributed to the evolution of modern democracy in Europe by enunciating the principle and working out the implications of popular sovereignty.

Another factor must be emphasized that by virtue of the French Revolution proclaiming as it did an innate right of an individual to a more unfettered life and an equality of opportunity to enjoy it, he had come to the dawn of a new era. His horizon had become wider and he was socially, economically and spiritually a new being. The great upheaval had the natural and inevitable effect of accustoming the human mind to the idea of change. For a thinking individual the future was full of promise.

In short, what the Renaissance was to the fifteenth century and the Reformation to the sixteenth, the French Revolution was to the eighteenth. Like these two great earlier movements, it affected all the countries of Europe despite their different national developments.

Let us conclude by quoting A. Goodwin, "In our time the French Revolution of 1789 has been overshadowed by the Russian Revolution of 1917 and its ideals were temporarily dimmed or distorted by the Fascist and Nazi revolutions. Critics inside France have spurned its emphasis upon the primacy of the individual in relation to society and the State,

while foreign observers have asked whether it was, after all, 'a mistake' and whether the price which France had to pay for its conquest of liberty and equality was too great. Historians are more disposed to bring the Revolution of 1789 into focus by comparative studies of other revolutions and by emphasizing that its essential contribution to the evolution of modern democracy was that it enunciated the principle and worked out the implications of popular sovereignty. Only in a limited sense can the French Revolution be regarded as the source of modern totalitarianism, for the Jacobin dictatorship and the 'revolutionary government' of 1793 were merely the provisional and abnormal forms to which French national security and its essentially liberal ideas contributed."

Effects of the French Revolution in Britain

The opening stages of the French Revolution had been generally welcomed in Britain. Her constitutional struggles of the seventeenth century, her unique system of parliamentary monarchy and her early industrial development made her particularly sympathetic to the revolutionary idea.

The people in Britain got the impression shortly after the outbreak of the Revolution that France was trying to establish a parliamentary government on the lines of that in their own country and this they considered a flattering compliment to the Glorious Revolution of 1688. They were glad that the Old Régime in France was being ended. The Declaration of Rights of Man appealed to the youth of Britain.

Demand for Parliamentary Reform

The most immediate and obvious effect of the French Revolution was to stimulate ardour for parliamentary reform. The old society for the advocacy of reforms, "Society for Constitutional Information" suspended since 1784 was revived in 1791. A new society, 'Society of Friends of the People' founded in 1792, was an aristocratic body of the Whigs. One of its members was Charles Grey who was later on to carry out the Reform Act as Prime Minister. Another society, "The London Corresponding Society, was also formed early in 1792

by Thomas Hardy. It was the first democratic propagandist body of the people ever started in Britain for the encouragement of constitutional discussion. Hardy fixed weekly subscription for members at a penny. Within a few months the number of its members rose to 10,000. Similar societies were started in other cities of Britain. Thus the movement for parliamentary reform received a fillip and the Dissenters, whose ministers included many able men, naturally took the occasion to urge the abolition of all legal disabilities in public life.

Charles James Fox (1749-1806), the fiery leader of the large and influential Whig party, defended the French Revolution in Parliament. When he exclaimed at the news of the fall of the Bastille, "How much the greatest event that has ever happened in the world! and how much the best!", the majority of his party agreed with him. Most Englishmen also felt something of his enthusiasm. France had been symbolized by "wooden shoes and black bread" emblems of tyranny and poverty, but now events were occurring which might mean a new age for all. William Wordsworth hailed the Revolution in following words:

"France standing on the top of golden hours
And human nature seeming born again".

Coleridge likewise acclaimed the dawn of a new era.

William Pitt the Younger (1759-1806) not unfriendly either welcomed with relief the embarrassment of Britain's old enemy. As expected the active radical leaders, such as Tom Paine and Thomas Hardy, acclaimed the Revolution as the greatest blow struck for liberty since American independence.

Influence of Edmund Burke

There was, however, one dissentient voice—that of Edmund Burke, a prominent Whig and a great *litterateur*—which was in no small measure responsible for producing a reaction in the minds of the mass of Englishmen against the Revolution, and rendering nugatory all talk about parliamentary reform. In November 1790, he published his famous *Reflection, on the French Revolution*. Though he had advocated wide liberty for the American colonies, Burke no more believed in the "rights

of man" than in the rights of kings, and considered that any assertion of such rights savoured of atheism. He held the view that the state was an organism, and changes in it could be brought about by slow degrees, and not in a violent manner as was being done in France. Political institutions could not be remodelled according to the theories of philosophers. The inherited traditions, the legal system and other institutions were bound to influence the growth of the state and no amount of philosophical theories could alter them. If any effort was made to alter the political institutions abruptly, that was bound to result in the dissolution of the organism. He therefore, deprecated the resort to extremism and violence, which in his view, would produce anarchy, tyranny and war. In other words, he believed in the maxim "Good order is the foundation of all good things."

With prophetic insight Burke wrote : 'The Revolution is an attack on property and lawful privilege ; it is therefore an attack on security and civilization. It will abolish monarchy and it will destroy religion. Much anarchy will lead to military despotism and it will declare war in Europe. That war will be a war to the finish. There is not in the long run room in the same civilized world for two such antagonistic systems, side by side, as the old monarchy and aristocracy, and the new system of republicanism and equal rights.' Burke had the prescience to make such an observation in 1790. However, it must be pointed out that while advocating his views and depicting in graphic colours the horrors of the French Revolution, Burke ignored altogether the idealism and nobility of some of the leaders of the Revolution. His views were thus lopsided.

Burke's "*Reflections*" was a toxin to a society, puzzled, ignorant, and ill at ease, and unconsciously ready to be panic-stricken. The book which was the manifesto of the counter-revolution was sold like hot cakes. Every "gentleman" followed the advice of George III and read it.* It is on

*George III was delighted to read Burke's *Reflections* and told everyone, "Read it ; it will do you good ; it is a book which every gentleman ought to read."

record that no fewer than seventeen thousand copies of the book were sold in six days. It had a rapid marked effect.

What Burke said was soon in the heart and on the lips of the governing classes in Britain and Europe.

The *Reflections* provoked many replies. The best of these, Mackintosh's *Vindicioe Galliccoe* an acute, temperate, and academic criticism produced little effect. But *The Rights of Man* of Thomas Paine, author of the celebrated *Common Sense*,* was more than an answer: it was a Brilliant if crude counter-manifesto of the extreme Radical and Republican school, which summed up an embittered democrat's hates and hopes.

Split in the Whig Party

As the Revolution became more clearly republican and violent, public opinion in Britain became alarmed and increasingly accepted Burke's view of it. Many of the Whigs disowned the leadership of Fox who was in sympathy with the aims of the Revolution, and though he was not in favour of excesses of the Revolution, he remained a firm believer in its aims. He just could not understand the apprehensions of Burke. Thus the publication of Burke's *Reflections* divided the Whig party and created a breach between Fox and Burke.

Anti-revolutionary Wave in Britain

The threat of disorder spread to Britain when in 1791 the mob in Birmingham attacked a reform banquet, wrecked Dissenting chapels, and sacked the house of Joseph Priestley

*Paine's pamphlet *Common Sense* appeared in January, 1776 that is, six months before the American Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776). The pamphlet was an explosive blast of literary energy that shifted the feelings of the mass of Americans so that they were motivated to act for the rightness of their own cause rather than the wrongness of the King's. "You are not mere rebels," *Common Sense* told them, "you are leaders." The cause of America is in great measure, the cause of all mankind," Paine wrote in the introduction.

Next to Declaration of Independence, *Common Sense* may be America's best known but least-read historical document.

the radical philosopher. The temper of the nation was such that from now onwards it required real courage to become a member of any reforming society. In fact, the opinion of the nation was now totally opposed to the Revolution and all its deeds. The "September Massacres" of 1792, followed by the November declaration of the French Convention which undertook to aid all foreign people who wanted to recover their liberty, completed the process of changing the mind of those who had faith in the ideas of the French Revolution.

Policy of Repression

The British Government decided to take stern action against those who were suspected to be revolutionaries. In the case of Scotland Lord Braxfield started a series of prosecutions for sedition. In his own inimitable way, Stevenson has graphically described the brutality of Lord Braxfield in some of the noblest passages of English literature. Thomas Muir a young lawyer, was sentenced to fourteen year's transportation. His only crime was that he had started a reform society and had also visited France. Thomas Palmer was sentenced to seven years' transportation for writing an address advocating parliamentary reform and drawing attention to the fact that liberty was on the decline in Britain.

In spite of the stiff attitude of the Government the reforming societies had the courage to hold a convention in Edinburgh in 1793 for the purpose of supporting the cause of parliamentary reform by rational and lawful means. The convention contained representatives of fifty societies, and the discussions there were purely academic. However, the police cracked down on the convention resulting in its break-up. In the following year, the important delegates were prosecuted on a charge of treason and sedition, the charge against them being that they were trying to form a convention on the lines of the one in France, and even trying to overthrow the legitimate government of the country. Although these persons were all honourable men and law-abiding citizens, they were sentenced to fourteen year's transportation. One of the members of the jury which had heard this case ruefully remar-

ked afterwards, "we were all made to convict innocent people". And in 1844, the martyrs of this madness were honoured by a monument of the Calton Hill in Edinburgh.

Similar prosecutions were started in England also. In 1794, the government decided to take action against the leaders of the London Corresponding Society and the Society for Constitutional Information. Thomas Hardy, Horne Tooke and John Thelwall were prosecuted on the charge of high treason. Thomas Hardy was tried first, and honourably acquitted by the jury. When Horne Tooke was tried, he summoned Pitt (the Younger) as a witness to prove that the Prime Minister himself had a few years earlier said the same things, which were now being treated as high treason. He was also acquitted and when the same verdict was given in the case of Thelwell, the government stopped further prosecutions. The English juries no doubt showed greater courage and independence than the Scottish juries.

When the Government failed in the law courts, it passed a series of laws to crush revolutionary movement in Britain. The Alien Act was passed in 1793. The Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act was passed in 1794. The Treasonable Practices and the Seditious Meetings Acts were passed in 1795; in 1799, Acts were passed for the suppression of such societies as still existed. Debating societies were also subjected to certain restrictions. Printers were required to obtain certificates. The law against Combination among workmen was passed in 1799. All these legislative measures amounted to a virtual suspension of the constitution.

A fact worth noting is that the public opinion in Britain was behind the Government. Even Francis Place, a member of the London Corresponding Society, had to admit that the mass of the shopkeepers and working people approved of the action of the Government, "such was their terror of the French regicides and democrats."

Postponement of reforms

In 1797, Charles Grey introduced a bill in the House of Commons for the reform of Parliament. Fox who had

throughout this period raised his voice against repression and fought for the liberties of the people lost his following. The bulk of his Whig comrades joined hands with the Government under the leadership of Burke. The measure fell through.

Thus the important effect of the French Revolution in Britain was the enactment of repressive measures and the postponement of parliamentary reforms. In the words of Ramsay Muir, "The main immediate result of the French Revolution in Britain was thus to bring to naught a promising movement of political reform, and to diminish traditional liberty of thought and speech, which was the most precious inheritance of the British Commonwealth."

Involvement of Britain in War

Another effect of the Revolution was that Britain was involved in a war with France. To begin with Pitt sturdily believed that the French Revolution was not likely to involve Britain in war. As late as February, 1792, he repealed taxes, reduced the naval estimates and said, "Unquestionably there never was a time in the History of this country (Britain) when from the situation of Europe we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace than at the present moment". Pitt was never more wrong than when he uttered these words. Hardly had he spoken these words than the situation changed. Revolutionary France declared war on Austria and Prussia and invaded the Austrian Netherlands. Pitt still trying to delude himself held "that this did not call for British action, since the integrity of the Habsburg dominions was no longer an object of British diplomacy", but the bellicose poster of France caused widespread public uneasiness. The deposition of Louis XVI and "September Massacres" further hardened public opinion in Britain against France. But Pitt was moved and still clung to his old opinion.

In November 1792, however, two actions by France further aggravated the situation. The first was the publication of the "Edict of Fraternity" which promised French assistance to all foreign peoples who might wish to recover their liberty. It

was clearly an incitement to the discontented in Britain and elsewhere and, therefore, a challenge to the government. The second was the opening of the Scheldat estuary to the shipping of all nations on the grounds of natural rights. But this action was in contravention of an International treaty—the Treaty of Westphalia of 1648—which had assured the exclusive navigation of the river to Holland. In other words, France struck a blow at the Dutch by declaring the Scheldt an open river. Britain was a signatory to the treaty which had closed the Scheldt and was also an ally of Holland. France now seemed to be preparing to invade Dutch territory, and Pitt let it be known that Britain would regard this as a hostile act. War was quickly accepted as inevitable in Britain. The trial and execution of Louis XVI on January 21st, 1793 stirred a storm of indignation in London and Chauvelin, the French envoy, was ordered to leave Britain, one day after his recall had been decided at Paris. It mattered little now from which side the inevitable declaration of hostilities came. At Paris the arrival of Chauvelin was accepted as decisive and on February 1st, 1793 France took the final step and declared war on Britain and Holland—a challenge warmly welcomed by George III, and an overwhelming majority of his subjects.

The war thus started between Britain and France was to continue till the very bitter end.

After all is said and done, the French Revolution did awake a new fervour in Britain which no amount of persecution and public misunderstanding could destroy.

Effects of the French Revolution—A summing up

In short the French Revolution, frightful though it was, heralded a new era in the history of Europe. It sounded the death knell of the Ancient Regime with its foundations of autocracy and feudal privilege. It made radical changes in landholding, education, the legal system and the relationship between church and state. Age old privileges had been abolished. Many nineteenth century revolutions against autocratic rulers were based on that of the French. The Declaration of the Rights of Man championed the cause of democracy.

The French Revolution had helped to foster a spirit of fellowship in which the people felt that they could share common joys and sorrows. It was the French Nation rather than the king which became the symbol of this spirit. This spirit was symbolic of nationalism and there was a flowering of this spirit of nationalism during the nineteenth century.

The slogan of the revolution, liberty and fraternity was learnt by lovers of freedom in all countries and still expresses the dream of mankind.

The French Revolution put into practice the idea that sovereignty comes from the people from below and not from above. As Dewey says, the History of the nineteenth century is one of very gradual but definite advance towards the sovereignty of the people and a great deal of progress which has been made can be traced directly or indirectly to the influence of the French Revolution,

The Origins of Modern Nationalism

(The unification of Italy & Germany)

Effect of the French Revolution

The French Revolution was significant both in theory and action. The leaders had proclaimed the new principle of popular sovereignty. The French Constitution of 1791 declared that sovereignty is one indivisible, inalienable, imprescriptible, it belongs to the nation, no group can attribute sovereignty to itself nor can an individual arrogate it to himself. Such principles were a challenge to every existing government in Europe and its importance was revealed in the change of title of the French ruler when the king of France became the king of the France. The French Revolution has clearly demonstrated that it was possible for a people to overthrow its established government and set up another.

Effect of French conquest and results of the French Rule

The impact of French conquest and the rule brought about a growing concern for the nation's political future in Germany and Italy. Praises of the French Revolution were sung by poets like Klopstock and Wieland in Germany. In Italy, the events in France were welcomed by the educated classes who

had suffered under the existing regimes. Not only this the sweeping changes imposed on Germany and Italy by Napoleon Bonaparte had destroyed the old centres of loyalty and inspired hopes and visions of future independence. Freiherr Von Stein who lost his hereditary possessions had the foresight and a sense of greater loyalty when he wrote—"I have one fatherland only and its name is Germany". Even Mazzini the prophet of Italian independence acknowledged his debt when he wrote: "My own natural aspiration towards liberty were fostered by constantly hearing my father speak of the republican era in France; and by certain old French newspapers which I discovered hidden behind my father's medical books"

The Vienna Settlement

The demands and the aspirations of the people were overlooked by the Vienna Settlement. No attempt was made to create a German or an Italian state. Territories were returned to the old rulers or placed under new one with little or no regard for the wishes and desires of the inhabitants or even their cultural bonds.

The cumulative effect can be summed up in the words of the Greek revolutionary Theodore Kolokotronis, who said: 'The nations knew nothing before, and the people thought that the kings were gods upon earth and that they were bound to say that whatever they did was well none. Through this present change, it is more difficult to rule the people'. In Europe it proved impossible to prevent the development and spread of new ideas after 1815.

Nationalism appealed to those who wished to establish for themselves a permanent and important place in a changing society. In Germany and Italy this was obvious in the case of the middle class, lawyers, civil servants, university professors, teachers and traders.

Above all nationalism appealed to the youth of the countries. Cavour wrote, "The ardent youth of the country sigh after nationality". In Germany Burschen-Scheften was founded in 1817 to work for the unity of the German people and Young Italy established in Italy; both drew its members from the student community. The students were so active in

Naples that the king ordered, just before the revolt of 1848, that all students should be sent away from the city because they were "full of new ideas, liable to get excited and quick on the draw".

This period also saw the alliance of nationalists and liberals because both felt that their main goal was the overthrow of the existing authoritarian regimes. In the process it brought together men of different political views. Mazzini was an ardent Republican while Cavour believed in Constitutional monarchy.

Apart from this there were some people who looked upon nationalism as a solution for the existing economic problems. In 1862 the Chamber of Commerce of Cologne stated in a resolution that "Unity is the fundamental condition for the successful creative activity of Germany in the economic sphere because only unity can remove the unnatural barriers which still hinder the exchange of goods in the domestic markets". In Italy too there was a similar demand which came from a small group of economists, businessmen and politicians. Balbo in his "On the Hopes of Italy" asserted that Italy could never exploit the advantages of its geographic position on the route between Europe and Asia while the country remained divided into small separate states.

To further inculcate national consciousness, efforts were made to promote the use of national languages. As a German writer very aptly remarked: "The preservation of nationality depends specially on the maintenance of language".

Unification of Italy

In the nineteenth century more than one obstacle impeded the path of Italian unity. The most important was the fact that Italy lay under the heel of foreign domination. Austria was entrenched in the north, her satellites—Princes of Austrian birth—ruled in Tuscany, Modena and Parma, while in the south a Barbarian dynasty governed the two Sicilies (Naples and Sicily). Yet scarcely important was the temporal power of the papacy, which cut Italy into two halves and was insurmountable barrier to the unification of the peninsula.

Italy like Greece was a land where almost every spot had its own territories and genius loci a circumstance which served to accumulate local jealousies and to retard national growth. IN ITALY wrote Metternich 'PRINCES ARE AGAINST PRINCES, TOWNS AGAINST TOWNS, FAMILIES AGAINST FAMILIES AND—MEN against MEN'

In these circumstances the prospect of united Italy seemed remote. But it found in MAZZINI a prophet of the Italian movement. He grasped the vision of a united Italy. He established the solidarity of young Italy, for the youth of Italy he looked to find the salvation of his country. He merits all the honour due to a prince whose life was devoted to the pursuit of a great ideal. His propaganda brooked the political horizons of Italians and created a vigorous public opinion in favour of national independence having amongst the makers of modern Italy he held an imperishable place.

Italy in 1845

000 "We are a people" wrote Mazzini in 1845, from one and twenty to two and twenty millions of men, known from times immemorial by the same name as the people of Italy, enclosed by natural limits the clearest ever marked out by the Deity—the sea and the highest mountains in Europe, speaking the same language, modified by dialects varying from each other less than do the Scotch and the English, having the same creeds, the same manners, the same habits.....proud of the noblest traditions in politics, science and art, that adorns European history, having twice given to humanity a tie, a watchward of Unity—once in the Rome of the Emperors, again, ere, they had betrayed their mission in the Rome of the Popes ; gifted with active, ready and brilliant faculties—rich in every source of material well being that fraternally and liberally worked could make ourselves happy and open to sister nations the brightest prospect in the world.

"We have no flag, no political name, no rank among European nations. We have no common centre, no common fact, no common market. We are dismembered into eight States—Lombardy, Parma, Tuscany, Modena, Lucca, the Papedom, Piedmont, the Kingdom of Naples—all independent of

one another, without alliance, without unity of aim, without organised connection between them. Eight lines of custom-houses, without counting the impediments appertaining to the internal administration of each state, serve our material interest, oppose our advancement, and forbid us large manufactures, large commercial activity, and all those encouragements to our capabilities that a centre of impulse would afford. Prohibitions or enormous duties check the import and export of articles of the first necessity in each State of Italy. Territorial and industrial products abound in one province that are deficient in the another, and we may not freely sell the superfluities or exchange among ourselves the necessities. Eight different systems of currency, of weights and measures, of civil, commercial and penal legislation, of administrative organisation, and of police restrictions, divide us, and render us as much as possible strangers to each other. And all these States among which we are partitioned are ruled by despotic governments in whose working the country has no agency whatever. There exists not in any of these states, either liberty of the press or of united action, or of speech, or of collective petition or of the introduction of foreign books, or of education or of anything. One of these States, comprising nearly a fourth of the Italian population belongs to the foreigner to Austria : the others some from family ties, some from a conscious feebleness, tamely submit to her influence."

In the circumstances chances of a United Italy seemed remote. Faced with absolute and suspicious governments debarred from freedom of political discussion, jealously and strictly controlled in all their movements, Italian patriots could only find an outlet for their energies in secret societies or 'sects' which sprang up every-where but more so in Naples. These secret societies were the direct outcome of a system which closed all other avenues of political activity. "We Italians," cried Mazzini, "have neither Parliament, nor hustings, nor liberty of the Press, nor liberty of speech, nor possibility of lawful public assembly, nor a single means of expressing the opinion stirring within us". In Naples the CARBONARI as the society was called, had recruits from all the discontented elements against

the rule of Ferdinand I and their influence was seen in the revolt which broke out in 1820. The insurgents forced the Neapolitan prince to grant a new constitution, who not willing to compromise his position invited the Austrians to help him. The revolt was put down. While the embers of the revolt were being stamped out in Naples another was lighted in Piedmont. Victor Emmanuel had two alternatives either to give into the wishes of his people or suppress the revolt by force. Not willing to do either of these he chose the path of least resistance and abdicated in favour of his brother Charles Felix. The Regent was Charles Albert who imbued with a liberal spirit, gave into the wishes of the rebels and proclaimed a new constitution. But the concession was immediately revoked by the new King. This led to civil war and with the help of Austria the rebels were crushed at the battle of Novara.

The years that followed were one of gloom for the Italian people since the revolts had failed in both Naples and Piedmont. Absolutism and reaction had been victorious. Italy however did not escape the effects of the Revolution in France in 1830 which led to revolts in Modena, Parma and the Papal States. French assistance though eagerly hoped for did not come. Austria thus enjoyed a free hand and all hopes of success were thus lost.

Austria and Italy

Though the revolts had been suppressed, thanks to Austrian assistance, they drove home the one and important lesson to the Italian people—the dire need to expel the foreigner. It was realized by one and all that no success could be achieved without putting an end to Austrian domination. All parties were now agreed and no argument was required to convince the nationalists that Italy could never be free and independent till she was under the Austrian yoke. The price of Austrian support and protection was Austrian tutelage which the rulers of the city states were willing to accept so long as they could retain their power and privileges much to the annoyance of their subjects. But who cared for the wishes

of the people. Austria was the common foe and her expulsion was the first and foremost task of the nationalists.

Mazzini

Mazzini was the real prophet of the Italian movement. He had started the society of "Young Italy" because he believed that, "Place youth at the head of the insurgent multitude, you know not the secret power hidden in these youthful hearts nor the magic influence exercised in the masses by the voice of the youth. You will find among the young a host of apostles of the new religion". It is the peculiar merit of Mazzini that he grasped the vision of a United Italy. "Italy", he wrote, "wills to be nation and one she must become, happen as it may. As certain as I am writing these words, this age will not pass ere the protocols of the Treaty of Vienna shall have served for wadding—perhaps on the march to Vienna itself—for the muskets of our Italian Soldiery". Mazzini's task was to educate the Italian people to realize that it was a nation and not merely a geographical expression, that the whole Peninsula, though divided by artificial political barriers, was a living unity with a common heritage of traditions and historic measures. His appeal was addressed to, "men speaking the same language, treading the same earth, cradled in their infancy with the same maternal songs, strengthened in their youth by the same sun, inspired by the same memories, the same sources of literary genius." The Carbonari had no doubt served a useful purpose in fanning the flames of patriotism but they suffered because of their lack of organizing capacity.

But while Mazzini gave to the Italian world the ideal of a united Italy, it was reserved for other men to translate his ideal from theory into fact. The other two Italian leaders who particularly aroused the national sentiment of their fellow countrymen were Joseph Garibaldi and Vincent Gioberti. The former advocated to Mazzini's wordy enthusiasm his own example of brave and striking deed, while the latter wrote a series of philosophical works that appealed personally to the upper class and especially to patriotic members of the clergy. He also urged the Pope to put himself at the head of the liberal and patriotic movement and to form a confederate of

Italian Princes.

The Liberal Pope

In 1846 Pius IX ascended the Papal throne and this marked the beginning of the revolution which led to the expulsion of the Austrians and the unification of Italy. The new Pope was believed to be anti-Austrian and a liberal, he had studied the writings of Gioberti. His first step was the proclamation of an amnesty for all political offenders. The act was a virtual defiance of Austria and it signified that in the eyes of the Church patriotism was not considered a crime. "We were prepared for everything", confessed Metternich, "except for a Liberal Pope; now we have got one and there is no answering for anything". The Amnesty was followed by other measures such as the council of state, the membership of which was thrown open to laymen, the establishment of a Municipality in Rome and the formation of a civic guard. These measures coming from the most conservative government in Italy was interpreted as a call to arms by the Italian people. The Sicillians were the first to revolt and a constitutional government was set up.

By 1848 public opinion in Italy was prepared for experimenting with constitutional government and national unity. As the year 1848 progressed rioting occurred in the Austrian Provinces of Italy. When the whole Austrian empire rocked with revolution and Metternich was driven from Vienna, the Italians in Lombardy and Venetia thought the time had come for throwing off the foreign yoke. The Pope sent troops to aid them. The king of the two Sicilies and the Grand Duke of Tuscany did likewise. To cap the climax King Charles Albert of Sardinia which was the only one state in all Italy absolutely independent of foreign control formally declared war against Austria and assumed the military leadership of the Italians. It looked as though Italy would immediately be freed and unified and revolutionized. But unfortunately at the hands of the Austrians he suffered severe reverses. The Austrians won a decisive victory at Novara over the king of Sardinia in 1849. King Charles Albert abdicated in favour of his son Victor

EMMANUEL II and Sardinia made peace with Austria promising to withdraw from Lombardy. The battle of Novara enabled the Austrians to restore their autocratic sway over the Italian provinces once again and the revolution of 1848 seemed a dismal failure.

Though Charles Albert had abdicated his throne, he had sealed with his martyrdom his devotion to the Italian cause. He had done his best but failed. Years earlier Charles Albert had said that, "to my dying days the words "Patriotism and Freedom from Foreign rule", will cause my heart to throb". "When the opportunity occurs," he had declared, "my life, my sons lives, my arms, treasure and all will be expended for the cause of Italy." Events prior to his abdication had proved the truth of this statement. "We shall march", he had said, "with the times", and a number of salutary reforms were set on foot, which were designed to transform Piedmont into a modern state, and to eventually prepare her for the work of national reconstruction.

The king of Sardinia alone among the Italian princes kept his promise and retained the constitution of 1848. He alone struggled to the end with the Austrians. In 1850 a certain Count Cavour became his minister of agriculture, industry and commerce. In the following year 1851 Cavour became Prime Minister and minister of foreign affairs and he did more practical work for Italian unification than Mazzini, Garibaldi and Gioberti or even Victor Emmanuel. He was the greatest statesman that Italy produced in the 19th century and one of the greatest diplomats of the world.

Having assured the successful operation of constitutional government within the kingdom of Sardinia and having increased his country's economic resources and reorganised its army, Cavour looked forward to liberating Italy from Austria's domination. He was however convinced by the sorry experience of 1848-1849 that Sardinia alone would be unequal to the task of defeating the mighty Austrian empire and if he were to drive the Austrians from Italy he must have foreign assistance.

With consummate diplomatic skill Count Cavour proceeded to isolate Austria and to win for Sardinia the favour of Napoleon III. In 1855 he caused Sardinia to join France and England in the Crimean war against Russia. The Italian soldiers acquitted themselves well in the campaign and at the peace congress at Paris 1856 Cavour dismissed into the ears of the French and English representatives the miseries of Italy and the mistrust of the Austrians. He got nothing from the Crimean war, but indirectly he won the sympathy of England and the friendship of the French emperor.

Closer and closer Cavour drew the bonds with France until in 1858 Napoleon III secretly promised to aid Sardinia in driving the Austrians from Lombardy and Venetia and in return Cavour promised that Sardinia should cede Savoy and Nice to France. Meanwhile Cavour carried on numerous secret intrigues with a view to undermining the government of the other Italian states and preparing the whole Italian nation for a general uprising at the right moment against foreign domination. He built up pro-Sardinian parties in Tuscany, in the Papal states and in the two Sicilies as well as in the Austrian provinces. He did not hesitate whenever it suited his purpose to conspire with republican followers of Mazzini and Garibaldi.

The first attempt to free and unify Italy had failed in 1849. Ten years later everything was in readiness for a second great attempt and this was Cavour's work. In 1859 Austria excited by obvious military preparations in Italy declared war against Sardinia. At once Napoleon III of France declared war against Austria and French troops crossed the Alps to join those of Victor Emmanuel, while the allies invaded Lombardy popular uprisings occurred in Tuscany, Parma and Modena and in the Papal states—the Dukes fled and Cavour took over the government of the three Duchies and a part of the Papal states. In the meantime in the summer of 1859, the Franco-Sardinian armies won grand victories and drove the Austrians out of Lombardy.

After protracted and angry negotiations peace was made between France and Sardinia on one side and Austria on the other (Treaty of Zurich) and a settlement was effected between

Sardinia and France in 1860. In accordance with these arrangements, Austria retained Venetia (Venice), Trent and Trieste, but lost all control direct or indirect over other parts of Italy. Sardinia seemed the cession of Lombardy (Milan) from Austria and the annexations of the three duchies of Parma, Modena and Tuscany and a district of the Papal states (Romagna). France obtained Savoy and Milan.

After this settlement in northern and central Italy Garibaldi secretly aided and abetted by Cavour conquered all southern Italy within five months. With the characteristic unselfishness in the case of a united Italy this republican patriot voluntarily turned over his whole conquest to King Victor Emmanuel. Cavour in order to unite Naples with Sardinian territory in the north appropriated another larger state of the Papal states having only this city of Rome and a little surrounding country under the temporal rule of the Pope.

In 1861 Italy was freed and united under the king of Sardinia except for two regimes.

1. The Papal states of Rome and 2. the Austrian provinces of Venetia (Venice). In this very year Victor Emmanuel dropped his title of king of Sardinia and assumed the title of king of Italy. The Sardinian constitution of 1848 was extended and applied throughout the new national state and the first parliament of united Italy met at Turin.

Political unity of Italy was now almost achieved. Rome and Venice alone were needed as the coping stone of the empire, Venice was acquired in 1866 when the inheritance of the Austro Prussian war furnished Italy with an opportunity to strike a blow at her traditional enemy. Rome came into Italian possession in 1870 when the Franco Prussian war compelled the retreat of the French garrison.

This completion of his life work Cavour did not live to see, for he died in June 1861. But he lived long enough to create the Italy of the Italians and won the undying gratitude of the Italian people.

Unification of Germany

At the beginning of 1848 Germany was still a hodge podge

of separate jealous states. It embraced more than thirty monarchies including Austria, Prussia, Bavaria, Hanover, Saxony, Wurttenburg, Bagden and Hesse, the four aristocratic republics of Hamburg, Bremen, Lubeck and Frankfurt. These states differed greatly from one another in size and strength.

Unlike Italy, Germany possessed at the beginning of 1848 a form of national union. It was the 'German Confederation' created by the Congress of Vienna in 1815 as a kind of continuation of the Holy Roman Empire. But it was only a form. It had few powers and its assembly or Diet (meeting in the free city of Frankfurt) consisting of personal representative of the German sovereigns was hardly more than a permanent congress of ambassadors. Each state was at liberty to make war or peace as it saw fit and to legislate as it would without reference to the Diet of the German confederation.

Austria whose Hapsburg rulers in the old days had been Holy Roman emperors held the Presidency of the German confederation. In Austria the dominant figure from 1814-1848 refused to recognize the principle either of nationality or of democracy and he successfully utilized Austria's influential position to prevent the unification of Germany and the spirit of individual liberty or constitutional government.

Metternich SAT ON THE LID until 1848 and firmly held it down. Beneath Metternich's LID however Germany was seething with popular discontent. Everything seemed in readiness for a revolution which might usher in a strong and democratic national German state. In February 1848 a revolution at Paris overthrew the Bourbon monarchy. Immediately there were rumblings far and wide throughout Germany. Suddenly the lid on which Metternich had been sitting blew up.

To put a stop to rioting and bloodshed at Berlin King Frederick William IV dressed himself in revolutionary colours appointed middle class ministers and promised to grant a constitution to his people. Most of the German monarchs were compelled to follow the example of the Prussian king. And to cap the climax the Diet of the German confederation was induced to authorise the election of a National Assembly which should establish a united and democratic Government for all Germany. Apparently with the utmost ease and prompt-

ness Germany was to become a democratic nation.

The national assembly was elected by universal manhood suffrage and met at Frankfurt in May 1848. Its members were chiefly from the middle class, men of brains and wealth, patriotic and liberal.

After long deliberation the Assembly coopted in December 1848 a DECLARATION OF THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE—equality before the law, religious liberty, the right of petition and freedom of speech, publication and association. The Assembly adopted in April 1849 a compromise in constitution. A German empire was to be formed as a class federation of the thirty odd German states headed by the king of Prussia as emperor and controlled by a parliament of two chambers, one representing the states and the other representing the people.

A Revolutionary chaos had occurred in 1848 in Austria and the Austrian empire gradually recovered from it and the new and youthful emperor Francis Joseph celebrated his triumph by reviving the policies and practices of Metternich who had already fled to England.

Austria also now refused to recognise the constitution of the Frankfurt Assembly. King Frederick William IV was booked not to fight Austria for the headship of Germany. The Princes of the Smaller German states were only too anxious to undo the work of the Frankfurt Assembly and to preserve their own independence. The result was that despite popular protests and even republican uprisings in some places, the German confederation was revived in 1851 to 1858. The first Diet of the restored confederation repealed the Declaration of the Fundamental Rights of the German people. Germany fell back into division and disunion. In 1851 she still lacked democracy and national unity.

The most famous conservative whom the revolutionary commotions of 1848 brought into prominence was Otto Von Bismark, a member of the influential class of Prussian landlords. For several years 1851-1859 he represented the King of Prussia at Frankfurt in the Diet of the German confederation. In 1862 he was appointed Chief Minister of Prussia. As Chief Minister he remained from 1862 to 1890 expanding

Prussia, erecting the German empire and shaping most of the policies which were to grind Germany in latter years as well.

The first thing Bismarck did upon becoming chief minister was to back King William I's demand for reorganisation and increase of the Prussian army. While universal military service was being enforced with Prussia, Bismarck directed his forming policy toward a future struggle between Austria and Prussia for the headship of Germany. He placed the Czar of Russia under obligations, Prussia, by offering to help him suppress an insurrection of the Poles in 1863. He duped Napoleon III by hinting that France might obtain compensation if Prussia were given a free hand in Germany.

The Schleswig Holstein Problem

In 1864, Prussia under the astute guidance of Bismarck joined Austria in a war against Denmark. The actual occasion of war between the two leading powers of the Germanic Confederation (Austria and Prussia) arose from the thorny problem of the Schleswig Holstein duchies. These duchies, although subject to the crown of Denmark had maintained an independent existence for four centuries and strenuously resisted the efforts of the Danish Government to make them an integral part of the kingdom. The situation was complicated by the fact that while the male line of the Danish royal house appeared likely to come to an end, the Salic law, prohibiting succession in the female line, still prevailed in the Duchies. This meant that the personal union between Denmark and the Duchies would soon come to an end unless the autonomy of the latter was first destroyed. A crisis was created when Holstein organised a revolt against Denmark in 1848 and appealed to the German people for help and assistance and whose support she readily received. Holstein and Schleswig were thus caught up in the great wave of national enthusiasm which was now sweeping Germany and henceforth their fate was linked with the destiny of the German nation. The problem was not purely a German one it also had a European aspect for any attempt to break up Denmark and make Germany a strong naval power in the Baltic inevitably raised opposition. Prussia's intervention on behalf of the Duchies was cut short by the

convention of Malmoe and the settlement known as the London Protocol signed in London in 1852 which ensured the integrity of the Danish monarchy but provided for a measure of autonomy for the Duchies. This compromise proved unworkable and the relations between Denmark and the Germanic federation grew inevitably strained. In 1863 matter came to a head when the Danish government imposed on Schleswig-Holstein a constitution which practically destroyed the independence of Schleswig, thus setting aside the London Protocol. This gave Bismarck the opportunity which he was to use in the interest of Prussia. "From the beginning", Bismarck wrote afterwards, "I kept annexation steadily before my eyes", but at the movement he did not reveal his real intentions. The events of 1848 had made it clear that Prussia needed an ally in case of European intervention. He therefore persuaded Austria whose fears of Napoleon's Italian policy made it necessary for her to cultivate the friendship of Prussia and accept the Prussian proposal of a joint intervention in the Duchies. A justifiable excuse was found in Denmark's violation of the London Protocol which left England, France and Russia without any legal justification to even protest. War followed in which Denmark was defeated and deprived of the Duchies. At first they were administered jointly by Austria and Prussia. In the meantime Bismarck utilized the interval to secure Napoleon's neutrality and Italy's co-operation. Bismarck realized that Austria would never accept Prussia annexing the two Duchies and therefore steadily worked to bring about fighting. Single handed he forced a war on Austria. Austria had no option but to take on the challenge. The decisive victory of Sadowa, July 1866 established the superiority of Prussian arms over Austria and this was followed by the defeat of minor German states that had supported Austria. Important changes were introduced in the German political system by Bismarck which gave Prussia immense power and authority and laid the basis for the modern German Empire.

Austro-Prussian War

Bismarck opposed William's desire to acquire Austrian territory although Venetia was given to Italy. Bismarck was-

determined to drive out Austria from Germany in order to achieve a free field for Prussian expansion but did not wish to permanently create a wedge between the two countries which would prevent a future alliance against France or Russia. As a result of the Peace of Prague (1866) Prussia added the territories of Schleswig Holstein, the kingdom of Hanover, the Electorate of Hesse (Hesse Cassel), part of Hesse-Darmstadt and the city of Frankfurt. As a result Prussian population increased by four million and the Germanic Confederation created in 1815 was dissolved and Austria was excluded from taking part in German affairs. Prussia now became head of the North German Confederation, comprising of all States North of Mainz. Bismarck created a parliamentary assembly (Reichstag) elected by manhood suffrage and a federal council (Bundesrath), composed of deputies from the different States. In the Bundesrath Prussia had only seventeen seats out of forty three and this numerical minority in fact helped her to hide her real superiority and to reconcile the smaller states to their inferior position. What must be borne in mind is that these seemingly illusory concessions were well worth displaying, for real power and authority in all matters of importance, defence and foreign affairs were determined by the Prussian King. In internal affairs however each of the smaller states possessed a large degree of independence and did not lose their individuality in the collective unity of the federal body. Bismarck deliberately left many problems vague and undefined. The Southern states of Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt no doubt were independent but they were in constant fear of being annexed by Napoleon, whose desire for compensation on the Rhine had been revealed to them by Bismarck. They were in the circumstances forced to enter into a defensive alliance with Prussia which thus enabled her to control their armies.

The war between Austria and Prussia was the first step in the creation of the German Empire, the second was the war between Prussia and France.

Relations between France and Prussia had never been friendly ever since the victory of Napoleon Bonaparte at Jena in (1806). Bismarck, a shrewd diplomat as he was, did not

permit his judgment to be clouded with traditional feuds and what he described as "stagnating antipathies", and he did not mind utilizing any foreign power whose help may be required in achieving his objective that he never lost sight of. In the fifties he was in favour of better relations between Prussia and France. Right from the time Bismarck assumed office he outmanouvered Napoleon in both diplomacy and war. Napoleon failed to comprehend the real political situation in Germany and his avowed sympathy with the Italians led him to believe that Austria was an enemy of France and he even went to the extent of seeking an alliance with Prussia against Austria. In doing so, he believed that permitting Prussia to extend her influence in North Germany was only to counterbalance the power and might of Austria. He was totally ignorant of the real designs of Bismarck and when he woke to the realization of the Prussian danger it was too late. His aim was to keep Germany weak by preventing either Austria or Prussia to achieve hegemony. Accordingly, he remained neutral when the Austro-Prussian war broke out but the ease with which Austria was beaten upset his calculations. He had hoped for a long and dissipating struggle which would enable him to intervene and dictate his terms.

Bismarck on his part was only too happy at Napoleon's misconceived notions for he desired the much needed time to complete military preparations to fight France. Bismarck was convinced as he stated that "a United Germany was only a question of time, that the North German Confederation was only the first step in its solution . . . a Franco German war must take place before the construction of a United Germany could be realized That a war with France would succeed that with Austria lay in the logic of history."

Bismarck needed a war to complete the fabric of the German Empire for two main reasons. Firstly he knew that France would oppose all efforts to unite Germany under Prussian leadership and secondly the obvious reluctance of the Southern German princes to join the confederation could only be overcome if the German people were inspired and carried away by a fresh national impulse. Bismarck wrote—
"The German national feeling south of the Main, aroused by

our military successes in 1866, and shown by the readiness of the Southern states to enter alliances would grow cold again". Further he supposed that the gulf between the North and the South could only be effectively bridged only "by a joint national war against the neighbour (France) who had been aggressive for many years".

Franco Prussian War

Fortunately, for Bismarck events played into his hands. There was a war hysteria in France and all parties were agitated at the continued aggressive designs of Prussia and believed that a successful war was necessary to retrieve the tarnished fortunes of Napoleon and ensure the continuity of his dynasty. The growing tension between France and Germany could have been diffused by a rapprochement between the rulers. But unfortunately this was not possible on account of the prevailing public opinion in both countries and a mere spark caused a conflagration between the two countries. When nations are hell bent on war, it is never difficult to find an excuse. In this case a dispute over the succession to the spanish throne provided the spark which set the two countries aflame. The problem become the immediate cause even though a satisfactory solution was in sight. The battle of Sedan (1870) followed by the capitulation of Metz (October 1870) and the fall of Paris (January 1871) after a seige of four months completed the rout of the French. As a result of this war, Prussia not only acquired Alasce and Eastern Lorraine but also the merger of the states South of the Main in the North German Confederation. On January 18, 1871, the King of Prussia was crowned at German Emperor at Versailles. This was symbolic of the newly won German Unity.

What the Frankfut Assembly of 1848-49 had failed to achieve by speeches and majority votes had been realized by Bismarck through the BLOOD and CRIES of three wars. Thanks to the defeat of Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866 and France in 1871, the German Empire was finally established under the leadership of Prussia. Bismarck had thus realized the goal he had set before himself when he became chancellor of Prussia.

The Zollverein

Bismarck built the political edifice of the German Empire whose foundations had been laid by the ZOLLVEREIN (Customs Union). Economic unity prepared the ground for political unity and the various material interests promoted the growth of national feeling and encouraged national consciousness. It was Maassen in 1818 who had sown the seeds of ZOLLVEREIN by initiating financial reforms in accordance with the principles of Adam Smith. He had created a new tariff system which had done away with all internal customs and established free trade throughout Prussian territory. In the case of foreign goods moderate duties were imposed on manufactured goods but no taxes were levied on raw material. On the other hand transport duties on goods passing through Prussian territory were increased to such an extent so as to compel other states to join the customs union. This policy was detrimental to the cause of independence of smaller states who were faced with economic ruinations if they kept away from the custom union, which were now only engulfed by the scattered territories of Prussia but through them ran most of the commercial routes of Germany. Prussia lent a deaf ear to the criticism levelled against her by the other smaller German states while Austria chose to remain passive. This was so because the Austrian statesmen failed to visualize the important and immense issues involved. Rival commercial unions came into existence but the advantageous terms offered by Motz the Finance Minister after 1825 gradually ended all opposition and state after state joined the Union. In 1834 important states like BAVARIA, Wurtemberg, and SAXONY joined the ZOLLVEREIN and the system gradually embraced the whole of Germany. Austria having been excluded because of her isolationist and protectionist policy had no say in the commercial policy of Germany and freed Prussia of a possible rival who could challenge her ascendancy. This economic union gradually and quietly destroyed the political barriers that kept Germany divided as also put an end to the territorial and dynastic influences which worked towards separation.

Cavour and Bismarck—A Comparison

Inconcluding the survey of Italian and German unification movements in the nineteenth century, it will be worthwhile to make a comparative study of the two leading luminaries Cavour the maker of modern Italy and Bismarck the maker of modern Germany. The comparison reveals that both had striking points of resemblance and no less striking, points of dissimilarity. Both had the same objective—one sought the unity of Italy and the other the unity of Germany. Both were faced with a common foe—Austria which was an obstacle to the expansion of Piedmont as much as it was to the expansion Prussia. In each case however it was consummate state craft and diplomacy overcame apparently insurmountable difficulties and achieved surprising success. Here however the resemblance ends. The differences mainly were two—first Cavour was a liberal and Bismarck was a reactionary. The former was the leader of the constitutional party in Piedmont, the cardinal tenet of his political faith being the belief in free institutions. Although Cavour was compelled to use force to expel Austria from Italy, the unification of Italy was essentially a popular movement. The people worked hand in hand with monarchy for the achievement and realization of their national aspirations. Bismarck on the other hand was a reactionary. He believed that force rather than ideas, constituted the basis of government and he built a strong military monarchy in Prussia upon the ruins of the Parliamentary system. The German Empire that was established was based on the sword. In the second place Cavour was content to merge Piedmont in Italy but Bismarck could never agree to sink Prussian individuality in a German national state. The difference can best be expressed by asserting that Italy absorbed Piedmont whereas Prussia absorbed Germany. When Cavour died his work was substantially complete. Bismarck left behind problems and created an uncertainty as to the destiny of the structure he had created.

Rise of Liberalism in Britain in the Nineteenth Century

Compared to most countries about 1800, Britain was democratic. The English kings had over the years lost their power to tax, to suspend or veto parliament laws, to remove judges and to imprison people without any trial. The English had obtained considerable freedom of speech and press.

In spite of all this there was not much of a democracy because the government had only become less of an autocracy and more oligarchical, the members of the House of Lords consisted of nobles and officials belonging to the Church of England. Even in the House of Commons men had to possess sufficient property to be able to become a member. About five out of every six men were not eligible to vote. The Roman Catholics, Jews and the Protestant dissenters were debarred from holding office.

There was an urgent need to redistribute seats in England in 1800. There existed three kinds of Boroughs namely Pocket boroughs, Rotten boroughs and those without a special name.

In the case of the Pocket boroughs the single landlord possessed the entire land and was thus in an unassailable position of being able to nominate or ensure the success of members from his constituency. Rotten boroughs were areas comprising of deserted and depopulated villages which still

continued to send representatives to Parliament. People who owned these areas could alone decide who would be the representative. Sometimes they sent themselves up or sold the seat for a fat sum of money. The third type of boroughs may be designated as democratic constituencies as the number of people having the right of vote was sufficient to represent the general public opinion. A notable example of a Rotten borough was Old Sarum which though merely a bare green hill still continued to send two members to Parliament. In fact Rotten boroughs existed in many parts of England and a notable example was Cornwall. The number of voters in East and West Looe was approximately fifty and in the case of Liverpool and Westminster there were 1,000 voters out of population of 11,800 and 1,200 out of 18,200 respectively.

The Industrial Revolution had been mainly instrumental in the movement of people from one part of the country to the other. The industrial towns of Manchester and Birmingham with populations of 1,33,000 and 85,000 had no representation in Parliament and this was gross injustice to the people living in these areas. What was shocking and disturbing was that fortysix constituencies with less than fifty voters each sent up ninety members to the House of Commons and the Duke of Newcastle had still the privilege of nominating eleven members to the House of Commons. In fact six Lords or peers of the House of Lords nominated as many as forty-five members. The reality was that almost half the members of the House of Commons represented private interest. Even when such a state of affairs existed an English noble praised the system of government as "the best that ever was since the creation of the world and it is not possible to make it better". Time, proved that it could be better.

As early as 1689 John Locke the philosopher had asserted rightly that "To what absurdities the following custom, when reason has left it, may land, we may be satisfied when we are bare name of a town of which there remains not so much as the ruins, where scarce so much housing as a sheepcote or more inhabitants than a shepherd is to be found, second as many representatives to the grand assembly lawmakers as a whole country numerous in people and powerful in riches.

The strangers stand amazed at and every one must confess needs a remedy, though most think it hard to find 'one'. As late as 1783 Pitt the Younger made the remarkable observation that "this house is not the representative of the people of Great Britain ; it is the representative of nominal boroughs of ruined and exterminated towns of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates".

Keith Feiling also shares the same opinion when he says that the House of Commons was totally unrepresentative and the distribution of seats was simply notorious. Cornwall referred to above sent as many as forty four members.

Efforts in the direction of reform and equitable distribution of seats were made. Lord Chatham had condemned the existing system in 1766 and 1770. In 1776 John Wilkes had introduced a Bill seeking changes in the existing system. Even Pitt the Younger had introduced Bills in 1782 and 1783 but the outbreak of the French Revolution compelled Pitt the Younger to abandon his scheme of reforming parliament. The demand for reform surfaced again in 1815 after the overthrow and defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte. The Revolution of 1830 in France brought murmurs in its wake. Duke of Wellington had firmly asserted that "He was fully convinced that the country possessed at the present moment a legislature which answered all the good purposes of legislation and this to a greater degree than any legislature ever had answered in any country whatever".

The Tories who were in power in England however had the intelligence to realize that a few reform might satisfy the people and thereby prevent the possibility of a revolution. With this limited objective in mind they passed an Act in 1825 by which the labour unions were freed from the stigma that they were conspiring against the government. By 1829, religious disqualification for holding offices were abolished for both Roman Catholics and dissenters. However the people were far from satisfied. The Whig Party—the other political force in England made up of wealthy businessmen were determined to fight for obtaining representation for its members and the new industrial towns. However, the Tory government under the stewardship of the Duke of Wellington

would not budge an inch. This resulted in a defeat of the Tories and the Whigs came to power in England and Lord Grey became the Prime Minister.

Lord Grey introduced the necessary Reform Bill and had it passed thrice by the House of Commons only to witness it being rejected twice by the House of Lords. After its second rejection by the Peers, Lord Grey resigned. As no other person was willing to assume the office of Prime Minister, the King called Lord Grey to form a new government. Before he did so, Lord Grey obtained a written assurance from the king that he would create as many peers as necessary to enable the Bill to be pushed through the House of Lords. Eventually the Bill was passed in 1832 and is known as the Reform Act of 1832.

The Reform Bill of 1832

The Reform Bill of 1832 had two objectives, the first was to bring about a just redistribution of seats in accordance with the population of the areas and secondly to liberalise the voting qualifications to enable a larger number to become eligible to vote.

In order to achieve its just objective the towns were categorised into four classes. Fifty-six towns with a population of less than 2,000 were deprived of sending representatives to the English Parliament. In this category were the areas of Old Sarum, East and West Looe and others. Those areas with a population between 2,000 and 4,000 and numbering thirty could send only one representative. The third category consisted of towns like Birmingham, Leeds and others which had no representative in Parliament and were now authorised to send two members each. The last category included towns like Chatham and Wakefield which could send only one member to Parliament. The balance of sixty five seats were distributed among the *Counties*.

Every person living in a city and paying a tax of £ 10 per annum or owning a house of £ 10 rental value was given the right to vote. Besides the villagers who were permanent land-owners with an income of £ 10 or gave £ 50 as yearly revenue

were given the franchise.

The Reform Bill was a significant step forward in England's march towards liberalism.

The Reform Bill of 1832 had thus deprived the rich of their administrative power which now was passed on to the middle class. Many defects had been removed and it increased the number of voters.

This bill was the first stage in the development of democratic Rule in England.

Trevelyan called the Reform Act of 1832, the "Modern Magna Carta" and adds that it brought about a "constitutional revolution in England. "It had paved the way for democracy by filling the balance of power in favour of the middle classes. Ramsay Muir says that the Reform Act of 1832 was a departure from the earlier constitutional land mark in the sense that it was not the result of "prescription and precedent", and it asserted the superiority of "the whole nation, enfranchised and unenfranchised ?".

Trevelyan further states that "It is incorrect to say that the Bill gave all power to the middle class. Power which had previously resided in a privileged section of the landlords was now divided between all the landlords on one side and a portion of the middle class on the other. The £ 10 household franchise was not set up in the counties at all and even in the boroughs it did not affect the poorer clerks. It was because half the middle class were still left without votes that they eventually joined with the working men to demand a further extension of the franchise under Gladstone. If the First Reform Bill had given full representation to the middle class, the politics of the Victorian era would have taken a more distinctive class character than they actually did. The uniformity of the new borough franchise was the least democratic part of the Bill of 1832, if considered as a final settlement, for it excluded nearly all the working men. Yet this uniformity may seem its most democratic power if it is regarded as the first of a number of steps. Uniform £ 10 suffrage in 1832 ensured uniform household suffrage in 1867".

Barker, Aubyan and Ollard assert that "The importance of the Reform Bill of 1832 is sufficiently obvious. Its passage made possible the series of political and administrative reforms

that laid the foundations of modern England. On the other hand these benefits did not flow automatically from the extension of the franchise. The passing of the Reform Bill did not mean sudden triumph of the middle class over the aristocracy for many years yet political and social life was to be dominated by the landed gentry. By 1867 the Industrial middle class was beginning to gain the ascendancy over the landed aristocracy, but the process was gradual, and delayed by the conservatism of characteristic of the nation. The Reform Bill did not, therefore as many had feared, open the flood gate to radical legislation. "Thus did the British people accomplish a kind of revolution", according to Hall and Albion. They further add "It was a more genuine revolution than that which occurred in France in 1830. It did not dethrone a dynasty but it did destroy what amounted to a semif feudal monopoly of the British government in the hands of the landed aristocracy. The contemporary revolution in France provided one vote for every two hundred citizens ; in England the Bill gave the vote to one in every thirty, almost doubling the voters in the counties. The revolution, however, if we may call it such was characteristically British. It changed old methods and practices somewhat roughly, but did not end them altogether. The political power of the landlord class was reduced. The act did not put the middle class in the saddle, but it did elevate the upper middle class to a position of approximate equality with the country gentry. Practically nothing was done for the working classes. The Bill set a precedent and was an important landmark in the advance towards democracy. It was to be followed by far similar acts (1867, 1884, 1918 and 1928) which finally gave England universal suffrage. It strengthened another precedent, equally important. Although the House of Lords had surrendered none of its powers in theory, nevertheless the fact remained that when faced with the repetition of Queen Anne's mass creation of new Peers it had yielded against its will to the popular demand as expressed in a parliamentary election. The strategic retreat of Willington in 1802 was not forgotten, either by Gladstone later in the nineteenth century or by Asquith in the twentieth".

According to Prof. Lindsay Keir; "The effect of the Reform Act was to deepen the cleavage thus manifested between the two Houses. That harmony which had been naturally created when so many members of the Commons were the nominees of the Lords was destroyed with the abolition of so many nomination boroughs and the enlargement of the franchise. If members of the Lower House were in the political confusion which preceded the hardening of party organisation and discipline, largely free to oppose Ministers, they were even more free to oppose the Lords. The Lords responded to the challenge. It was under difficulties overcome only by Wellington's influence that they yielded to the laws. They regularly opposed measures threatening vested interests. He further says "The principle of popular sovereignty which the Reform Act had grudgingly but irrevocably accepted was bound in the end to do more than merely diminish the weight of the Crown and the Lords in Government and enhance the powers of a ministry reposing on a properly organised majority of votes".

According to K.B.: "The Reform Act had created new political climate to which political institutions would have to be adapted. For more than thirty years it was to condition the prerogatives of the Crown, the conventions of Cabinet government, the development of parties, and the relation between the opinions and interests which are the mind and body of social life and the political institutions which must serve and guide them. The effect of the extended franchise was to make it impossible for the King or Queen to secure a House of Commons amenable to the ministers of his or her choice. Both William IV and the young Queen Victoria were inclined to think that the electorate would support a government which the Crown had chosen. The danger was that had the Crown become associated with a particular party it might have been crushed between an increasing electorate and an intensified party struggle. The solution was for the Crown to recognise that the choice of ministers must be determined by the result of a general election. This also implied that organised opposition to the government in power was not only constitutional, but politically respectable, because such an

opposition was a latent alternative government, ready to take over when the government in office should resign, either with or without a general election, as circumstances might make convenient. So long as a group of ministers could be found acceptable to the existing House of Commons, a general election was not necessary until the legal term of the House had expired. It was not until the present century that it became crystal clear that it was for the government in office to determine whether an appeal to the electorate was necessary to clarify the distribution of political parties in the House".

According to David Thomson : "The extension of the franchise which it achieved was perhaps the less significant part of it, the £ 10 householders in the towns, the £ 10 copyholders and long leaseholders, the £ 50 short leaseholders and tenants at will in the counties, meant a total net addition of only 217,000 voters to the old electorate of 435,000. This was less than 50 per cent increase. Much more significant was the redistribution of seats among the constituencies. No less than 56 of the old, rotten boroughs lost their separate representation and 30 others lost one of their two members in the Commons. But representation was given to 42 other boroughs which had been without it, and these were in most cases the big new industrial and commercial town of the north (Manchester, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds and the rest) which had grown so greatly in years. The counties were also given 65 additional seats. The gross over-representation of countryside and small agricultural towns was ended and the new municipal middle classes of industry and business were given a more just share of power in constituting the House of Commons. The Act instituted electoral registration as the necessary technical qualification for voting, and this not only opened a door to new and more intricate methods of corruption but also, in the long run, evoked more efficient party organisation to ensure the inclusion of sympathisers on the registers. The absence of the secret ballot (which was not introduced until forty years later) left ample scope for pressure, victimisation and electoral disorders. The Eatanswill elections described in Dickens belong, it must be remembered, to the period after 1832. The discrepancy between the

exaggerated hopes and lofty aspirations of those who backed the Bill and the realities of the Act's achievement betokened future instalments of reform, and that is perhaps the chief importance of the Act. It offered a taste of reform and whetted the appetite for more, it left abuses enough to provoke sustained agitation for another generation, but it set a precedent for changing even the most antiquated and traditionalist of institutions by legislative action. The methods of popular association and agitation which won so signal a victory in 1832, could be elaborated and refined, and become the basis of modern 'petty organisation'.

According to Gregg, "In practice, the Reform Act was not the disaster to the Tories that they had forced ; through their numbers dropped, their chief leaders were all returned to the first Reformed Parliament. The working classes were bitterly disappointed. Working men were not enfranchised, and no hope was offered of a further measure of reform. Even the middle classes were dissatisfied ; the Reformed Parliament and its Cabinet was predominantly aristocratic. The real gainers were the Whigs who held over 500 out of the 658 seats in the new House."

There was both confusion and anomaly in the Reform Bill campaign. It was a middle class measure, yet was sponsored by a Cabinet with a majority of Peers. It was intended to benefit the manufacturers and industrialists, yet was supported by the very workers whom they begrudged the..... The press hoped it would prevent revolution ; the workers expected it to be followed by Reform. In the event it produced chartism, feared by middle classes and aristocracy alike and the Factory Acts, which most of the industrialists detested, while leaving the middle classes still to fight their biggest battle against the Landlords—that for the repeal of the Corn Laws.

"The Reform Act, by the fact and the manner of its passing, had done a great deal more than enfranchise one half of the middle class. It had asserted the power of the whole nation, because it had been carried by the popular will against the strenuous resistance of the older order represented in the House of Lords. It had been a fair fight and a straight decision.

Forty years before, the people had been told by Bishop Hornby that "they had nothing to do with laws, but to obey them," and they had submitted to the decree. But now at least they had learnt how to organise their power and to exact obedience from the law makers. The sovereignty of the "people" had been established in fact, if not in law."

The Chartist Movement

The English workers and the labouring classes were dissatisfied with the Reform Bill of 1832. They therefore drew up a huge petition called a *Charter* and contained over a million signatures. The Chartists as these people were designated demanded universal manhood suffrage, secret ballot, abolition of property qualification for membership of the House of Commons and payment to its members. Conservatives were shocked ! One of them described the Chartist doctrine as opposed to nature and the word of God. The petition was turned down by the parliament and the Chartists Movement became weak and eventually collapsed. However the efforts of the Chartists were not in vain as most of their demands were eventually conceded.

The outcome of the Chartist Movement was the Second Reform Bill of 1867 which gave the right of vote to all householders, lodgers and occupiers of £ 10 annual rental value. All the owners of houses in cities were also given franchise as also the villagers who were giving £ 12 yearly as rent. Eleven boroughs whose population was less than 10,000 were completely disenfranchised. Twenty five more seats were given to the counties. Towns like Liverpool, Birmingham etc. were given more seats and the system of allowing two seats to each town was given up. The Act was described by Disraeli, the Conservative Prime Minister whose party was responsible for the enactment of Bill, as a "Leap in the Dark." Carlyle and Beg.....described it as "Shooting Niagara". Almost a million new voters were added to the existing ones and the electorate almost doubled.

According to Hall and Albion, "This Second Reform Bill of 1867 was more revolutionary than of 1832. It extended

the franchise in the counties and it all but made manhood suffrage universal in the Boroughs, thus making Great Britain, to all practical purposes, a political democracy. The Act of 1832 had shifted the balance of political control toward the middle class, the upper stratum of which was so interlinked with the aristocracy as to continue England's aristocratic tradition, modified but unrevolutionised. The Act of 1867 shifted the balance again to the left, this time toward the working classes. It remained to be seen how far the latter would go in making use of their new privileges. Disraeli was confident that the working men would prefer conservatives to liberals, Gladstone was as confident of the reverse. Almost everyone approved of what had taken place except a few like Thomas Carlyle whose pamphlet *Shooting Niagara* bewailed the grant of the vote to ignorant and unthinking men. He believed that once the upper classes gave up their control of the government they would never regain it.

The Ballot Act of 1872

The Act was passed in 1872 and the system of secret voting came into existence.

The Third Reform Bill (1884)

The Third Reform Bill passed during the Prime Ministership of the Liberal Prime Minister Gladstone removed the defects found in the previous Reform Bill and England became truly democratic. The franchise was extended to all farm workers and every owner of a house in a village or a city and the qualifications of franchise were made equal throughout the length and breadth of the country. As a consequence parliament became a truly representative body of the country.

Act of 1885

This was the Act—a sequel to the Third Reform Bill—which was passed in 1885. Boroughs with a population of less than 15,000 disenfranchised and the system of single member constituencies was established and each constituency was to elect one member to the House of Commons. Twelve new members were added, raising the strength of the House to 670.

The movement to grant franchise to women took many years and it was only in 1918 that it was extended to every married woman over 30 years and in 1928 to women over 21 years. In fact it was reluctantly that every citizen of 21 years of age was given franchise in 1928.

By these Acts constitutional development in England took place and the House of Commons became the true representative of the country. It was real national rule in the country. These reforms gradually altered the aims and structure of political parties. From the beginning of the present century labour entered politics and the labour party developed into an important political party of the country.

In retrospect it looks as if the British version of the liberal model—with the importance attached to the House of Commons and its political debate and to a serious press—depended upon a number of pre-conditions—the existence of a recognised political class many of whose members enjoyed financial independence, the restricted character of the franchise, the habit of deference to authority among many of the non-enfranchised, and above all of the spontaneous limitation of the scope of the central government. The nineteenth century thinkers often understood these preconditions and were aware of the distinction that their successors chose to blur, the distinction between liberalism and democracy. They were well aware of the pressure to bring more and more citizens within the pale of constitution, making universal franchise the sole conceivable goal. It was foreseen that larger and larger electorates would demand more and more and that the state would become a welfare organisation wanting to redistribute wealth, that such electorates would more and more demand that their representatives should act as a channel through which their demands for legislative action were given direct effect. Liberalism talks of representatives, democracy of delegates. It was visualized that as electorates grew and politics became more and more impersonal, national party machines would develop whose patronage would be essential for a new political class—a class increasingly divorced in membership and ethos from the social elite with which in the 19th century it was largely identical. These

changes many of them a part of the American experience in the first half of the 19th century had made rapid strides in Britain between the Second Reform Act of 1867 and the giving of votes to the eighteen year olds in 1969—the enactment that eventually broke the historic link between some economic and social responsibility and the exercise of political power, for political power without a property commitment is an entirely new thing.

Only one advantage that the liberal model enjoyed in the 19th century, Britain still persisted—as an island the country had either a very small military force or one largely based overseas. For this reason, the fear of the “man on horse back”, the advent of a military saviour to redress the excesses of democracy, was always largely absent. While the liberal form of government, like other forms of government, rest ultimately on force, the liberal model is one in which force can be kept in the background. Indeed, when it is compelled to use its ultimate coercive power for political purposes, it automatically suffers a defeat, for it is no longer liberal.

What is surprising about Great Britain is not the degree to which the liberal model has been abandoned but the extent to which it has endured. Habits of action formed and procedures in the courts and Parliament established during the liberal era have largely survived. The mass media may or may not have an undue influence on voting patterns, but individuals are not bribed or bullied and ballot boxes are not stuffed. The government controls the parliamentary time-table but does not stifle the voice of the minority. Controls of various kinds over the press, television and radio no doubt exist but these are certainly not used to deprive the government's critics of what they wish to say. Indeed some of the pointed observations about the subservience of Members of Parliament to the party whip have hardly applied to the Parliaments elected in the sixties and seventies of the present century. Whether the reasons for Great Britain's ability to run a democracy in the liberal style are due to the high degree of continuity of the country's institutions or due to the national character or to the British respect for procedural forms irrespective of content is debatable.

The Beginning of a Revolutionary Movement in Russia Culminating in the Revolution of 1917— A Background

No part of the world in the nineteenth century could long remain immune from outside influence. Even Nicholas I (1825-1855) began to construct railroads and it was only a question of time when Russia would be linked by rail with the West. From the time of the French Revolution there were liberals even in Russia, and some of those at court nearly coaxed Alexander I (1801-25) into granting a constitution. This group had as their object a revolution from above. They hoped to get the Czars to grant reforms, such as a parliament and local self government, and, whenever the press was free (which was not often), they strove to create a public opinion among the nobility favourable to these ideas.

Reform and Reaction under Alexander II (1855-81)

It was through the influence of the Liberals with Alexander II that he decided to sanction the following internal reforms : (i) Emancipation of the Serfs (1861) ; (ii) Institution of

'Zemstvos', 1864¹—The administration of local government affairs was to be carried on by 'Zemstvos' (assemblies) which were provided for in each Russian district and province by a decree in 1864. Though under the control of the landlords and possessed of only limited jurisdiction in local matters (such as education, public hygiene, famine relief, etc.), the 'Zemstvos' nevertheless represented a relaxation of the customarily rigid centralization ; (iii) Judicial Reforms (1862). A decree in 1862 provided for a system of courts similar to those of the United States to displace the old system of secret and arbitrary courts. Provision was also made for trial by jury, public court proceedings, tenure of office for judges, and codification of the laws.

Reactionary Policy of Alexander II from 1865 to 1881

Alexander's ardour for reforms was considerably cooled by the Polish Insurrection (1853)—Also, after ten years as Czar, Alexander felt capable of handing the Russian Liberals, and a policy of reaction was begun. The power of the 'Zemstvos' was curtailed a strict censorship of the press was instituted, and political offenders were exiled. The reactionary policy resulted in considerable opposition of the Czar.

The Rise of 'Nihilism' in Russia

It became evident that a more violent revolutionary movement was called for. Certain intellectuals, gaining their inspiration from the extreme followers of Marx rather than from the French and English Liberals, organised in Russia the movement known as 'Nihilism.'

According to the definition of a nihilist as given by Turgenyev in his novel, "Fathers and sons" he (a nihilist) is a man, "who does not bow down before any authority, who does not take any principle on faith, whatever reverence that principle may be enshrined in". According to Stepniak, "The fundamen-

1. 'Zemstvos' were district and provincial assemblies to which the administration of certain of the affairs of the districts and the provinces was committed from 1864 to 1917.

tal principle of nihilism was absolute individualism. It was the negation, in the name of individual liberty, of all the obligations imposed upon the individual by society by family life, and by religion". Thus Nihilism was an extreme radical movement of the persons bitterly disgusted with the Russian political, social, and even religious system. For a time, defiance of authority became a creed and the destruction of all existing order a religion for a section of the youth of Russia. The nihilists became anarchists. They wished to destroy almost everything in the existing order. The struggle with autocracy seemed so hopeless that at first they were not concerned with a constructive programme. Their method was terrorism. Through assassination plots, carefully worked out in secret societies, they hoped to terrorize autocracy into submission. Each official was a marked man, even the Czar himself; while the agents of the police were the commonest victims. Such was policy of repaying violence with violence. Obviously each nihilist took his life in his own hands; but there was no flinching in their devotion, and it would be hard to find in history a more earnest and self-sacrificing group than these men and women who struggled to free Russia by the bomb."

In time, however, the nihilists came to the conclusion that in order to win the masses it was necessary to arrive at some really constructive ideal, and to this end they adopted socialism. With the true fervour of missionaries they planned during the seventies what was known as the "going to the people". They went to the peasant villages, sometimes lived the life of the peasant, and conducted a secret propaganda. But it was an utterly hopeless task, however heroic. There was nothing much more isolated than a peasant village, and the police were only too ready to pounce on any stranger. Moreover the peasant was too thick-headed to get much inspiration from Marx. "Manifestly some likelier material must be found".

The Coming of the Industrial Revolution and its Significance

The Industrial Revolution did not affect Russia until the latter part of the nineteenth century, and then a marked increase in commerce and industry followed. This increase

was due to the presence in the cities of cheap labour now made available by the emancipation of the serfs and the investment in Russia of foreign capital (chiefly French) with which railroads were built (Trans-Siberian Railway, 1891-1905).

With industrialization there emerged in Russia for first time a well-developed middle class comprising mostly of factory workers-urban proletariat. It was this group of factory workers that was now to be relied on as the cohorts of revolution. And it was not unpromising material. Conditions in Russian factories were as bad as anything in the worst days of the Industrial Revolution ; and while anything might have been tolerable to the peasant who had been a serf, a young generation was springing up, less contented with its place in the crowded towns in which he toiled. From this class the message of socialism was bound to receive a response.

Foundation of Socialist Parties

(a) In 1897 the Social Democratic Party was founded for pushing the workers interests. Terrorism had seemed cowed under the harsh rule of Alexander III (1881-94), and even incipient Unions had been crushed ; but the effort of this Party for a time was to give the factory workers a greater sense of solidarity and the strength of a common creed.

(b) In 1901, a rural socialist party was also founded, known as the Socialist Revolutionary Party. Which, unlike the Social Democratic Party, believed in terrorism as a weapon, though they kept it for the present in reserve.

(c) In 1903, a more radical element in the Social Democratic Party split off from the main body on ground of favouring a stricter party discipline. This body came to be known as the Bolsheviks—the name signifies “majority men”, for the Bolsheviks were in a majority on the question which caused their secession, though as a party they remained far inferior in numbers to the Mensheviks (“minority men”). The Bolsheviks followed a young nobleman, Vladimir Ilyvick Ulianov, alias Lenin, who was destined in course of time to become the leader of the Revolution, and to change the political face of

one-sixth of the world, and to send shivers throughout the rest of the planet.

Two Main Streams

A revolutionary movement had thus shown its head in Russia. There were two main streams, the liberal and the socialist, the aristocratic-bourgeois and the proletarian.

Autocracy of Alexander III (1881-1894)

The forces of revolution, it must be pointed out, got renewed strength from the policy reaction followed by one of the most autocratic of the Czars, Alexander III. He had the help of two extremely capable men to maintain autocracy. Konstantine Pobedonostev (1827-1907) was a champion for reaction. He opposed even the slightest reforms and attacked parliamentary government, secular education, and the press. Plehve (1845-1904), as head of the police, concentrated his efforts on crushing all opposition to the government. His harsh, repressive measures carried out by a ruthless but highly efficient secret policy, made him perhaps the most hated person in all Russia, but he successfully stamped out all articulate revolutionary discontent. The imperial government became more centralized, and all elements of freedom in local government and secular education were removed.² In spite of the efficiency with which the liberal tendencies were thwarted, incompetence and corruption permeated the whole imperialistic government.

2. The Czarist government had been able to maintain autocracy in Russia because of (1) the loyalty of the Czar's assistants to the central government, (2) the control of the Greek Orthodox Church by the Czar, (3) the administration of education, which was extremely meager, being in the hands of the Church (Russia's illiteracy was greater than that of any other European country), (4) the successful coercion of liberal movements, (5) the peasants' conception of the Czar as a "Little Father", (6) the conservative agrarian group, (7) the history and tradition of the autocracy under leaders like Peter the Great and Catherine the Great, and (8) the prevalent opinion that democracy could not successfully cope with the problems of the Russian people.

Revolutionary Movement under Nicholas II (1894-1917)

The two streams of revolution (referred to above), flowing together, became a torrent in the reign of Nicholas II, the last of the Czars. "He was a man of small mentality and weak will, and by temperament so volatile that he was apt to follow the opinions of the last person who had been with him. He was also very Russian in his fatalism, and disposed to let things drift, feeling that somehow autocracy was part of the divine order of things and that it mattered very little who were its agents."

Nicholas II relied much more than his predecessor upon Pobedonostev and Plehve and, as was to be expected' monarchy became exceptionally oppressive under this weak and vacillating Czar. Incompetence and corruption showed their ugly heads more than ever. To make matters worse news poured in of a succession of disasters suffered by Russia in the Russo-Japanese war (1904-1905). The War served to reveal depth of corruption and incompetency in the Russian administration. At the tidings of the fall of Port Arthur, students paraded the streets of Russia, crying: "Down with autocracy" and "End the war".

The Revolution of 1905

It was the plight of the government which inspired a revival of the revolutionary movement of the 1905-906 which was, by and large, not distinguished by terrorism, but came right out in the open, as it were. Nothing could have been more innocent than the demonstration of January 22, 1905 (Sunday), when a huge concourse of strikers, headed by a priest known as Father Gapon, proceeded to the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg to hand over to the Czar a petition for the redress of grievances.

"*Bloody Sunday*."—The petitioners who were perfectly peaceful were fired upon for no rhyme or reason by Cossacks.³ The incident sent a thrill of horror throughout

3. Light-armed Russian cavarly soldiers.

Russia. Discontent increased, labourers struck, and the peasants pillaged and destroyed. There were even mutinies in the army, and though the war was practically over, it was decided to delay demobilization. The very foundation of Czarism seemed to be crumbling.

The October Manifesto (1905)

Thoroughly scared by the continued evidences of dissatisfaction, particularly in the army, which was his mainstay, the Czar announced the coming of a duma, or national assembly to be consulted in the matter of reforms. This Russian "estates general" was, of course, top slight a concession to please the public. The liberals at once agitated for a legislative body, to be elected on a really broad suffrage. With much more effect the socialists attempted a general strike ; and the movement was so successful that transportation ceased, most of the factories closed, and the nation's economic life was almost paralyzed. The Czar decided to make further concessions (for, after all, concessions could be revoked) ; so in October 1905 he issued what was known as the October Manifesto—the nearest approach Russia had to a constitution. "Certain fundamental rights, like the inviolability of person and freedom of conscience, press and association, were granted. Legislative power was also accorded to the duma, which was to be elected on a very broad suffrage".

There was great exultation, but it proved to be premature.

Counter-Revolutionary Movement

In December 1905, another great uprising of a desperate character took place in Moscow ; about five thousand people were killed before it was suppressed by the troops. It unfortunately helped to bring about a counter-revolutionary movement in the government. The liberal Witte, who was for a short time premier, had already been dismissed, and the Czar's ministers began to divide into two camps, one favouring concession, the other repression. Thus the government spoke with two voices.

Revolutionary Factions

The revolutionaries were also divided. They did not form an organized political party, but were broken up into groups. There were the moderates, or "Octoberists,"⁴ who took their stand upon the October manifesto of the Czar; there was the more advanced group known as the "Cadets", who advocated the establishment of responsible as well as representative government, and pressed for the bestowal of land upon the peasants by the forced sale of the larger estates. The rise of the reactionaries and their organising of the "Union of the Russian People" (1905) instituted a reign of terror to prevent liberal reforms and aided the Czar. Between the counter-revolution which set in the government and the divisions in the ranks of the revolutionaries the cause of reform fell to the ground.

First Duma (1906)

The first Duma was opened with great ceremony on May 6, 1906, by Nicholas II, but it soon became a scene of wrangling between the government and its critics. The Duma had no real power, and when it tried to control the executive it was accused of exceeding its bounds, and was dissolved on July 21st, 1906. In bitter disappointment about half the deputies withdrew to Viborg, in Finland, and issued the manifesto which takes its name from that place, exhorting the Russian people not to pay taxes or render military service to a government which had violated its pledges. But the people were not behind their deputies; the only result was to stiffen the government and to lead to the prosecution of the signatories.

Second Duma (1907)

In March 1907, second Duma was elected, but proving even more stormy than its predecessor, it was dissolved before it had sat for four months.

4. "Octoberist" was the name given in Russia to the progressive Conservative Party which after the Czar's manifesto of October, 30, 1905, united to maintain the constitution as set out in that document.

Third Duma (1907-12)

In order to prevent a repetition of what had happened in the first and second Dumas, the Czar by arbitrary decree summoned a third Duma on a revised electoral law, and a considerably reduced franchise. Proving amenable to the government it was allowed to live out its five years, and in 1912 was followed by a fourth Duma (1912-14), even more docile.

Reaction Set in After 1907

After 1907 reaction had set in, autocracy was in the saddle, and the exultation of the reformers had given place to a listless depression. Socialists were tried behind closed doors and sent to Siberia. Conspirators were constantly being hounded and executed. There were in reply recurring murders of officials and police, but on the whole the country "seemed quiescent, and the revolutionary movement abated."

Such was the situation in Russia in 1914.

The Revolution of 1917

The Russian Empire had represented for more than three centuries the superposition of a predatory Asiatic despotism upon a medieval mamorial society. The inflexible attempt to maintain this despotism by means of a cumbrous and corrupt bureaucracy, an army of native janissaries, a benighted church, and a reactionary feudal noblesse, in opposition to the economic and social forces of modern Europe, in which Russia constantly intervened as a political factor was destined inevitably to result in a violent revolution.

The failure of the first inchoate revolution of 1905 was followed by a period of reaction on the one side, and on the other by desperate preparations for the utter extermination of the existing system and its exponents.

The main causes of a Revolution in a country are to be traced to her social, political and economic conditions. When people are blissfully unaware of their actual conditions, they

pass their days peacefully. As soon as they became aware of these causes they take to revolution. The people who enlighten the people are the philosophers and writers. Such was the case with the Russian revolution. The main causes were :

Political Causes

Politically Russia in 1917 was in as bad a condition as France was in 1789. The rule of Czar Nicholas II was as autocratic as the rule of Louis XVI. The rule was thus both ruthless and oppressive. He was completely under the influence of his minister Plehve who was against all kinds of reforms. Like Marie Autoinette, the Czarinu exercised tremendous influence over the administration but she was notorious. She was also under the influence of the monk Rasputin. He was called the "Holy devil." To a great extent he was responsible for the reactionary policy of the Czar.

Though the revolution of 1905 had failed, yet the Czar had to establish the parliament or the Duma as it was called. The idea was to satisfy the discontented people. The powers were limited and the people were not given the right to vote. As has been rightly said—the Duma was reactionary, irresponsible and an instrument of the Czar."

To climax it all the administration was inefficient, autocratic and corrupt. People were tired and so they turned to revolution to bring about changes they desired. Social conditions in Russia were bad as the entire system was based on inequality. The masses were poor, ignorant, incapable and hungry while the upper classes led luxurious lives. The burden of taxes was borne by the peasantry. The legitimate demands of the people like freedom of speech and press and equality before law were turned down by the Czar. It has been aptly stated that "the perversity of Nicholas and his blindness to the potential strength of the new forces which were surging round him produced the revolution."

Awakening of the Labourers and the Miserable condition of the farmers

As a consequence of the Industrial Revolution, number of factories had been set up and the peasants left their fields and settled in towns to work in factories. Their conditions were deplorable low wages, and long hours of work. They could not form trade unions and were a miserable and wretched lot of people.

Equally bad was the condition of the peasants. Feudalism served as the basis of agriculture. Even though serfdom was abolished in 1861, their condition remained bad. They had small land holdings, primitive tools and methods of cultivation and bore the burden of taxation. They had no means to improve the land they possessed and a majority of the farmers did not even have enough to eat.

Influence of Writers and Philosophers

Generally an intellectual revolution gives birth to a political revolution. Writers and philosophers had made it possible for democratic ideals to prevail in the western world. Similar was the case in Russia. Of these writers mention must be made of Tolstoy, Turgneva and Dostovesky. The socialism preached by Karl Marx exercised a magical influence on the Russian minds. Russia thus had a mental upheaval before the actual revolution broke out.

Influence of the revolution of 1905 and European democracy

The Revolution of 1905 gave an impetus to revolutionary activity. The people had tasted blood and wanted more privileges and concessions. Not only this the Russians fought the first world war on the side of the Allied powers who were fighting to protect democracy ; democracy also became popular in Russia.

Military reverses in the first world war

The military reverses of Russia enraged and united the people. They held the Czar and his government responsible

and to remove him, they created the revolution. In the first world war the Russian army was badly mauled. They could not in fact fight as there was acute shortage of foodstuff and war materials. The country was faced with a catastrophe on account of the shortages on the food front and the reverses suffered by the Russians and heavy losses of men and money. The opportunity was there and it was the war that produced it—it produced the leader—Lenin. His great powers of intellect enabled him to dominate the liberation and to grasp the opportunity that others did not.

The Great War produced the final crisis by revealing the self destructive inefficiency of the Russian Government. There was no little enthusiasm and patriotism at the outset and hardly a dissentient voice ; all Russia looked upon the war as a “holy war”, requiring the fullest and staunchest effort. But Russia was not equal to a struggle such as this. She was still too backward a nation to vie with the technical efficiency of the West ; her railways were unsuited to the transportation of large armies ; her munition factories were unable to produce the volume of armaments required. Moreover there was graft in high places. The Ministry of War gave contracts to men who failed to deliver the goods, while they lined their own pockets. In the campaign of 1915, the supply of rifles failed : there were insufficient shells ; and Russia was badly beaten. There was naturally a public outcry. Pressed by the Duma, which came to be the mouthpiece of the discontent, the Czar dismissed the incompetent Minister of War but it was then too late.

During the most trying years of the war the Czarist government was dominated by the premier, the treacherous Sturmer —“a soapy mannered man with an overdone smile”—and the loathsome Rasputin*—one of the most sinister figures that ever polluted the pages of history. As it was, the Czar consulted the Czarina Alexandra—a beautiful and queenly woman, of strong will but of a morbid and superstitious nature—on all political matters. She in turn was influenced by Rasputin.

*Gregory Efimovitch Rasputin (1871—1961), Russian monk, charlatan and politician. Assassinated.

Who was Rasputin ?

He was a Siberian peasant, who after thirty years of obscurity became a wandering mystic and ultimately acquired the prestige of a saint. "He was a huge, ungainly, uncouth, and filthy profligate with an overmastering ambition to exercise power." His avenue of approach to the imperial family lay in the fact that he had a reputation for healing (probably he did possess some therapeutic powers) and on one occasion when the little Czarevitch, the heir to the throne, suffered a terrible attack of his strange malady he was what is commonly known as a "bleeder", Rasputin was consulted, and the attack was soon allayed. He came frequently to the palace, and said to have declared that the fate of the Czar and family was inter-woven with his own. In any case, Rasputin was not content simply to play the role of "court physician". He dabbled in politics, and through the influence for the Czarina he made and unmade ministers** "That he was in traitorous relations with Germany is not yet proved, but he was certainly an avowed pacifist, and his influence was deliberately defeatist". At that critical juncture of the War he was, therefore, certainly a 'fifth columnist' of a sort.

In short after the dismissal of Sazonoff in August 1916, the domination of the Czarist government by the treacherous Sturmer and loathsome Rasputin prepared the tragic 'denouncement'.

The March Revolution (1917)

During the early defeats in the War, Czar Nicholas II—did not alter his policies but continued to ignore the demands of the political parties and the submerged nationalities. Naturally popular discontent increased. The decrees of Nicholas dissolved the Duma and commanded the workingmen to cease striking. The Duma refused to dissolve, the workingmen continued to strike, and with the help of military garrison, a workingmen's council (soviet) was established at Petrograd, Nicholas II abdicated on March 15, 1917, in favour of his

**It was through Rasputin that Stumer became premier.

brother, but the Grand Duke Michael did not attempt to carry on the Ramanov dynasty (the dynasty to which the Czars belonged) because he knew that it was a hopeless undertaking under the circumstances. A provisional government predominantly bourgeois was established with Prince George Lvov as President. A Programme of liberal reform was planned, and a constituent assembly was to be elected to draw up a constitution.

The November Revolution 1917

The attempt of the middle class to establish a democratic government was hampered by—(a) the numerous national groups within the country; (b) the lack of any popular enthusiasm for an orderly democracy; and (c) the proletariat which desired economic and social reforms. Soviets were formed, discipline in the army became lax, and the Bolsheviks demanded the consummation of a peace with Germany. The aggressive Milyukov, minister of foreign affairs, desired to continue the war, but as the Soviets increased in power, they forced him to resign.

With help of the Socialists, Alexander Kerensky, tried to guide the Provisional Government to carry on the war and establish a liberal regime. But the partial reforms proposed failed to satisfy the growing group of revolutionary leaders, while the decision to carry on the war speeded the disintegration of the army. In November the provincial government collapsed, Kerensky fled from the country, and the Bolshevik group of advanced revolutionaries led by Lenin and Trotsky seized the reins. The political revolution of March was superseded by the economic and social revolution of November.

Lenin united the workers and peasants in his Bolshevik party and directed all his energies at toppling the provisional government. In November 1917 the soldiers occupied government offices. The provisional government was overthrown and the control of government passed into the hands of the Bolshevik party. Lenin became the President and Trotsky the Foreign Minister.

The communists had succeeded in ruthlessly seizing power. Lenin declared that “no oppressed class has ever come into power without passing through a period of dictatorship and the most democratic bourgeois republic is nothing more than a machine for the suppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie.

“Peace, land and bread” became the communist slogan, and all opposition was ruthlessly crushed.

The new government was weak and even Lenin admitted that “if the capitalist nations had any unity at all, we would not last a day.” German armies were on the verge of occupying Russia. In March 1918 Lenin signed the “Treaty of Brest Litowsk with Germany to end the war. Although the treaty was very harsh, and crushing yet Lenin knew he had no option because he was keen to get started with the building of communism in Russia.

Significance

The revolution of 1917 was an important event. It revolutionised the political situation of European countries and gave an important place to Russia in world politics. It paved the way for the social and economic process of Russia. In fact few events in the history of the world have done so much to change the course of humanity.

The revolution of 1917 signified the end of the autocratic rule of the Czars and the dictatorship of the proletariat was set up. It was to become a grand success under Lenin and latter under Stalin. The revolution inspired the workers of the world and it served as a great source of inspiration, because the Communist ideology has a powerful appeal. It gave rise to socialism in the countries of the world. In a sense the revolution is still on and is spreading its fangs to different countries of the world and engulfing new territories in its tentacles. Dr. J.E. Swain truly asserts that “certainly nothing has let loose such a deluge of condemnation and eulogy and nothing has so completely challenged orthodox theories since the French revolutionists overthrew the Barbons. The Russians in a few years have set up standards for a new way a living and thinking.”

10

Nazism in Germany and Nationalism and Militarism in Japan

NAZISM IN GERMANY

When the economic crisis began Hitler was forty years old, making efforts to do in Germany what Mussolini had done in Italy. Earlier in the year 1920 he had organised the National Socialist Party—Nazi in short. Under his shrewed leadership and stirred by his rousing speeches, the Nazi party gained some members. Discontented veterans, shopkeepers, workers and peasants imagined that Hitler would make Germany strong and great again. In 1923 he had attempted to seize power but the effort failed and he was imprisoned. It was at this time that he wrote *Mein Kampf*, the Bible for German militarism after Hitler became Dictator.

The party in 1920 had issued its twenty-five point programme which among other things asserted that “we demand the union of all Germans to form a Great Germany on the basis of the right of self determination enjoyed by nations, “and” only a racial comorade can be a citizen. Only a person of German blood can be a racial comorade without regard to religion. Consequently, no Jew can be a racial comorade. Further it called for the abrogation of the Peace treaties and the return of German colonies. In so far as economic matters

were concerned the programme wanted no increased incomes, limitation of profits from wholesale enterprise, land reform, nationalisation of all trusts, communalization of big departmental stores and no land speculation. It also called for increased old age and maternity benefits, reorganisation of higher education and government control of the Press. The philosophy underlying this was "the common good before the individual and lastly demanded the creation of a strong central power in the Reich, the unconditional control by the political central parliament over the whole Reich."

During the years 1920-1923 Hitler framed the basic postulates that were characteristic of the party during its existence. He was an expert psychologist and knew the importance of details like party uniform, its flags and its songs and endeavoured to give to an uprooted people a sense of belongingness that had been lost by the old traditional society. The magnetic character of the Swastika (an ancient and world wide symbol, a cross with the arms bent at a right angle, especially clockwise amblematic of the Sun and goodluck derived from the Sanskrit word Swastika—Swasti—well being—the nostalgic memories of the old imperial red, black and white colours, the simplicity of the brown shirt and arm band, the Nazi Salute—Hitler was appreciative of all these and laboured hard over them. As early as 1920 Hitler had foreseen the need of a band of strong devoted youngmen to protect meetings from violence and also the prevention and breaking up of meetings of the opposition groups. This group was the kernel from which developed the S.A., the fighting wing or "storm troop." This comprised of ex-soldiers veterans and hoodlums. They took part in all sorts of demonstrations and, 'made the rights hideous with street fighting and bloodshed.'

An equally important step was the publication of a paper "Racial Observer"—weekly at first but later only became a daily and used to spread Nazi propaganda and popularise its ideology.

By demagogic appeals to latent emotions—anti-semitism, fear of communism and resentment against the Treaty of Versailles the party soon gained considerable following among the lower middle classes who as a result of the widespread

unemployment and extreme frustration were suffering untold agony.”

The Nazi movement was anti-semitic, anti-communist and anti-parliamentary and obtained the backing of the remnants of the Pan German League and other patriotic societies. It also had the support of the extreme nationalists who had never reconciled themselves to the defeat of Germany and held those at the helm of affairs at that time as responsible for the crisis. Hitler made political capital out of the existing discontent and dissatisfaction.

Although the so called twenty-five point programme was never officially given up, yet the Nazis had no positive philosophy. It was essentially opportunistic. What was clear was Hitler's own ideas and his own inherent genius to take advantage of a given situation using age old cliches and shopworn slogans which could be easily applied.

Whatever Hitler's limitations, there is no denying the fact that he was a genius. He was a master of mass psychology and practically German mass psychology and undoubtedly the greatest demagogue in history. Through his awkward gestures and thrill, metallic voice were hardly fit for own orator, yet he possessed the knack of carrying people with him and of swaying a popular audience. Hysterical himself at times on such occasions, he was able to infuse the same hysteria among his listeners. If the subject matter of his speeches is impassionately dissected, it reveals that they all contain passionate in.....with a considerable repetition of the same ideas Hitler primarily appealed to the emotions of the people who had suffered emotionally. To these people he was a veritable Messiah who had appeared to redress their wrongs and to restore their shattered pride.

Imprisonment of Hitler

In November 1923, Hitler's party attempted a putsch (a coup). The attempt was unsuccessful, Hitler was arrested and sentenced to five years imprisonment.

Hitler's Mein Kampf

While in prison Hitler spent most of his time in dictating to his fellow prisoner Rud of Hess the first volume of his.

autobiography *Mein Kampf* which provided his Nazi movement with its indispensable bible. Originally he wanted to title the book four and a half years of struggle against lies, stupidity and cowardice—but eventually agreed to a brief title, *Mein Kampf* (My struggle).

In this book Hitler maintains that his basic political attitudes were formed in Vienna. He writes lyrically of his pride in being a German and explains his contemptuous towards the “inferior races”, especially if they were in a position of authority over the Real Germans. This intense nationalism led Hitler to scorn Marxism with its international creed. For him all Jews were not brothers. To him they were an alien malignant growth sopping the roots of Germanism. His attitude towards the Jews was one based on emotion and hatred and completely devoid of even an iota of rationality. To Hitler, Jews were responsible for everything he disliked in art, politics, social life and so on. Hitler in reality, it would appear to a psychologist, made the Jews a scapegoat of his own inadequacies. Hitler’s reaction to the War of 1914 is interesting and says that the war “was not forced upon the masses but desired by the whole people that thousands of other young men like him, overpowered by stormy enthusiasm fell down on their knees and thanked Heaven from an overflowing heart.” Not only this the book provided a keen insight to the author’s early life, his aspirations, ambitions, and programme and the basis of his party which was ultimately to overthrow the Weimer Republic and undo the Peace Settlement of 1919.

After his release from prison, Hitler directed all his energies to the reorganisation of his party and to increase its following to the maximum possible. The first important indication of its growth was revealed by the 1924 election when it captured thirty two seats in the popular chamber and polled nearly two million votes. The elections in 1928 caused a temporary setback to the party but the 1930 elections saw them polling about six and half million votes and made them in numerical strength second only to the Social Democrats.

In order to solicit support, Brüning in 1932 offered Hitler a place in the Cabinet but he refused for he had the political

patience to wait till he was strong enough to obtain power on his own terms. In April 1932 he challenged Hindenburg in the presidential elections and polled nearly thirteen and a half million votes as against Hindenburg's 191 million. There was no doubt that the Nazi movement had grown to a point where it was becoming difficult to keep it from swamping the government.

Progress of the Nazi Party :

The Nazi Party had gone from strength to strength as is evident from the year 1930 onwards. In 1930 the Nazi vote had suddenly shot up from less than a million to over six million and more than doubled in 1932. The economic crisis proved a boon to the Nazis. What with unemployment, higher taxes, financial ruin and business disasters there was great dissatisfaction prevailing among the German people.

The great depression of 1929-30 had plunged Germany into a veritable economic chaos. "The disaster," observes Schuman in *International Politics*, "begot 6,000,000 unemployed and general bankruptcy and impoverishment. Jobless workers flocked to the Communist Party. Desperate burghers (citizens of the town) and peasants joined the N.S.D.A.P. (the Nazi Party) whose hysterical *Fuehrer* (or *Fuehrer*, leader; appellation assumed by Hitler) promised prosperity, pride, and power through the overthrow of the 'Weimar Jew Republic', and the establishment of a glorious 'Third Reich' to be based upon anti-Marxism, anti-Semitism, anti capitalism, and a misty 'National Socialism'. Industrialists and Junkers (Conservative or reactionary aristocrats in Prussia who favoured social and political supremacy for themselves) subsidized the brown-shirted Nazi Storm-troopers, hoping to make use of them against communists, socialists, the trade-unions, and other threats, real or imaginary, to property and privilege."

In the presidential election of April 10, 1932, Hitler, as stated earlier, lost by a slim majority and Paul von Hindenburg, aged 84 and now very senile, was re-elected president for a second term. The Nazi vote rose to 37% of the total in the Reichstag election of July 31, 1932. The Nazi party gained 230 out of 607 seats, and became the largest single

party in the Reichstag. In another election in November, 1932, the votes polled by the Nazis fell by two million. In spite of this reverse, Hitler became the Chancellor on January 30th, 1933, as a result of coalition with the Nationalists and 'Big Business'. It happened on account of Hindenburg's dismissing the former Chancellor General, Kurt von Schleicher. Hitler thus assumed power not by "an electoral victory but by a conspiracy entered into against the last Republican Chancellor Kurt von Schleicher, whose old friend, Franz von Papen, resolved to use Hitler to put himself back in power. Papen had been head of the 'Baron's Cabinet' which Hindenburg had appointed after ousting Chancellor Heinrich Brüning in May 1932. In January 1933, Papen spun his plot. His tools, so he thought, were Hitler, mob hypnotist :.....Hindenburg, who had been re-elected to the Presidency nine months previously by the support of Brüning and of all the Liberals and Socialists in order that he might save the Reich from Hitler, was persuaded to 'save agriculture', (i.e., the *Junkers*) from 'agrarian Bolshevism'.. ...by dismissing Schleicher on January 30, 1933, and appointing Hitler Chancellor, Papen Vice Chancellor, Hindenburg Minister of Economics, and other reactionaries to the remaining posts".

Hitler's appointment was thus a political manoeuvre engineered by von Papen with a view to taming him to political strings of a coalition, and thus discrediting him "with responsibility divested of power". It is to be noted that Hitler became Chancellor on January 30th 1933 with three members of his party—out of twelve—in the cabinet. The rest were representatives of the nationalist parties, including von Papen as Vice-Chancellor. The men of the German Right—representatives of army and Prussian landowners, big industrialists and financiers—thought they would give Hitler enough rope to hang himself. The clever von Papen, they felt could be relied upon to outwit Hitler who lacked experience of high office and government. They thus made themselves the grave-diggers of the Weimar Republic.

Hitler Assumes Absolute Control.

Hitler's first act as Chancellor was to carry out his promise to Hindenburg to try to achieve a working majority in the

Reichstag. This required support by the Catholic Centre. The Chancellor had a conference with the Centre leader, Monsignor Kaas, which the latter thought was just to be a preliminary discussion. Hitler, however, clearly insincere in the effort declared after a new minutes that there was no basis for agreement. Therefore he obtained a decree from Hindenburg dissolving the Reichstag and March 5, 1933, as the date for new elections. Six days before the elections were due *i.e.*, on February 27, the Reichstag building was burnt down by Nazi secret agents. Hermann Goring, Nazi minister without portfolio in the new government, proclaimed that this was evidence of a Communist plot and proceeded to arrest leaders of the Communist party. The elections took place in a mood of anti-Communist frenzy and terror, whipped to fever pitch by the Nazis propaganda and accompanied by the use of extreme violence against all their opponents. Even so the Nazis gained only about 44 per cent of the total vote. However, if the Nationalist votes were added to the Nazis', the two together had a small majority, but the Nazis were not concerned about that. As soon as the eighty-one elected Communists had been excluded from their seats, the Nazis alone would have their majorities.

March 21st 1933, was set for the meeting of the Reichstag to be held at the Garrison Church at Potsdam, tomb of Frederick the Great and the Central shrine of the old cult of Prussian militarism. It would be difficult to imagine a greater contrast from the inception of the republic at Weimar. One of the first actions of the new Reichstag was to pass the Law for Removing the Distress of the People and Reich, popularly called the Enabling Act which provided that for four years the government would have the right to decree any law or treaty independently of the Reichstag.

This Act granted Hitler and his government dictatorial power with the cloak of legality attached to it. As for the Reichstag, it had voted itself out of effective existence—it ceased to exist except indeed as a ceremonial body which Hitler addressed from time to time on important policy developments. Thus, unwept, unhonoured and unsung, the

Weimar Republic went out of existence, and the dictatorship of Hitler was established beyond a shadow of doubt.

In October, 1933, Germany left the League of Nations and the already doomed Disarmament Conference. In November, Hitler asked the German nation, by plebiscite if it approved of his actions, and 99·3 per cent of the votes were for him. On August 2nd 1934, President Hindenburg died. He was dead only a matter of minutes when it was announced in Berlin that offices of president and chancellor would be merged. Shortly afterwards, the armed forces took a new oath. This oath was personally to Adolf Hitler, *Fuhrer* of the German Land and People. On August 19th 1934, the German people were invited a second time to register their approval of the new situation. About 90 per cent of the population (some 38 million) indicated approval. Public confidence under a totalitarian regime was, it appeared, boundless.

The Nazi revolution was over. The *Fuhrer* was in complete control.

Swiftly and ruthlessly Hitler made himself a dictator. The Communist and Socialist parties were abolished. Only one party, the Nazi party was left and any attempt or organise other parties was forbidden by law. The German States like Prussia, Bavaria and others were deprived of self government. **Purge within the Nazi Party (June 1934) :**

The forces that became responsible for Hitler's rise to power soon threatened to engulf him and the party machine seemed to be becoming unmanageable. The unruly elements that had entered the ranks and file of the party had to be controlled and the brown shirted storm troopers had to be kept in check as they had let loose a veritable reign of terror arresting and imprisoning and torturing people at will. What was even more disturbing was that Ernst Rohm the leader of the Brown shirts was plotting to establish his control over the army itself. However before things got out of control, Hitler was able to establish his authority with the destruction of this lawless element.

The story of the National Socialist Dictatorship in Germany is akin to that of the Stalinist purges in Russia. Hitler decided and for good that the counterparts to the

“second revolutionaries” like the Trotskites of Russia must be destroyed. On June 30th 1934, a date famous “The Night of the long Knives” more than a hundred well known figures including Ernest Rohon along with others were killed. These murders did go a long way in strengthening Hitler’s position. The German people had seen the terrible power of the Nazi regime and the party had been effectively brought under control.

“Moral codes are made for the stupid and the inferior” statements like this are indicative of the nature of Nazi dictatorship.

In Nazi Germany Jews were compelled to scrub streets. Their shops were burnt and they were deprived from their professions or fired from their jobs. In fact terror was a tool used to get rid of liberals, socialists, communists and even Nazis who were suspected of challenging the Fuehrer’s authority. The main instrument of this terror was the Gestapo the secret police—headed by Hitler ?

Germany became a dictatorship of the Nazi party and its flag with the Swastika emblem became the country’s flag. Justice was not a matter of right or wrong but merely a tool to help and assist in getting a verdict which helped the Nazi state.

To build his Greater Germany, Hitler knew he had to wage war. He therefore, rigidly controlled business together with farmers and workers in an economic set up like Mussolini’s-Corporate State. In fact “Guns before butter” became the slogan of the German people.

Not only this the Nazis controlled absolutely the social life of the people in Germany. Goebbels, the Minister for propaganda and Public Entertainment, in fact only promoted propaganda and prevented enlightenment. Even schools were used to develop loyal and obedient Nazis who would be willing to make sacrifices and would be ready to even die if need be, in achieving their goals of a great Germany.

What factors really enabled Hitler to achieve his objective and fostered the growth of Nazism in Germany ?

First and foremost was impressive personality of Hitler. His words were full of magic and he inspired courage in the minds of his countrymen.

The second factor is to be found in the character of the German race. The German people were self respecting and loved military tendencies. Thirdly, Hitler promised to regenerate Germany by destroying the Treaty of Versailles and establishing a German Empire. Fourthly, the economic crisis was exploited by Hitler. Fifthly he blamed the Jews for all the economic ills of the Nation and he had only to instigate the German people against the Jews who were hated most. Sixthly he drew Nazi volunteers from the demobilised soldiers of the first world war. It was they who protected Hitler's councils and crushed all opponents. Another potent factor in the rise of Hitler gave expression to destroy the treaty, the Germans only too willingly followed him.

As Langsam in his book 'The world since 1914' asserts—'The continuing hostile attitude of France, the quarrels over the Ruhr, the Rhine land occupation, the Saar and the reparation, the wrangling over disarmament—all these fed the anger of many Germans'.

The final triumph of the Nazis can be attributed to a quality characteristic of statesmanship which Hitler undoubtedly possessed. In the words of Gathorne Hardy (A short history of international affairs 1920-39). Hitler possessed, "an apparently *intuitive* capacity for the accurate computation of risks, and uncanny perception of the psychological moment for instantaneous and ruthless action."

From the above it is evident that Hitler's rise was due not only to his own sustained efforts but also due to circumstances that existed at the time and facilitated the growth of Nazism in Germany.

SALIENT FEATURES OF HITLER'S POLICY

The Third Reich. In the political terminology current in Germany, the medieval empire is called the First Reich, the period from 1871 to 1918 the Second Reich, the years from 1919 to 1933 the Weimar Republic or the Interregnum, and the

Hitlerite regime the Third Reich. The term 'Reich' cannot be properly translated into English ; but "it is a kingdom of Heaven, in the sense that it is or is to become, community in the acknowledgement and realisation of 'values', as well as a kingdom on earth".

I. Political and Military Aspects

The Third Reich is designated by Germans as a *fuehrerstaat* or leader states, a state based upon the principle of absolute obedience to the leader. It is not a republican one because the chief executive holds office for life and has power to nominate his successor. The nation has not got the power to choose the executive at certain intervals. At the same time the government cannot be said to be despotic, as the authority of the leader is ostensibly derived from the people. The Germans claim that under the Third Reich their Government is truly representative in character, because, according to their theory "true representation is the personification of the will of the people in a representative who feels himself to be one with the people". "But the will which he represents, or rather incarnates, is a will which he inspires, and which would not exist without his inspiration. He represents a will projected from himself and reflected back upon himself. Immediate representation of the people by a single leader can never be representation of the original will of the people".

Position of Hitler in Political set up. An important key to understanding the political organisation of the Nazi State is the position held by Hitler. He occupied three separate functions, that of chancellor, party leader, and president. After he inherited the presidential office, he never used the title ; it smacked too much of republicanism. At first he was referred to as leader and national chancellor, after the war started, simply as leader (*Fuehrer*). In fact, he was of greater significance than the combination of his three functions would suggest. "He assumed a sort of magico-religious position. He embodied the collectivity of the racial Germanic urge for existence and power. He was the court of last resort. He was the law. Otherwise intelligent people, including foreigners,

were held in thrall by his eyes, his personality. They would answer, questions on some outrageous Nazi aberration with paragraphs beginning with the words, "Adolf Hitler has said" That was the end of it, Humble Germans identified themselves with their leader, who incarnated what Plato might have called the archetype (model), or Rousseau, the general will."

Nazi Germany was one of the most intensely personal governments that the world has ever seen.

"*Principle of Leadership*". Hitler's extraordinary position was partly rationalized by the "principle of leadership" ("*Fuhrerprinzip*"). This principle established a hierarchy of command such that each person gave unconditional obedience to those above him and was entitled to the same from those below. No more elections were held in Germany. All officials in every area of government and party line were appointed. At the apex of the pyramid was Hitler.

Repudiation of the Military Clauses of Versailles

From the earliest days of his political career Hitler had inveighed against the Treaty of Versailles. Now that he was in control, it was to be expected that he would try to implement his invective. Reparations were already a thing of the past; there was no possibility at the moment of risking war to restore the old frontiers. The military clauses seemed to be the one area in which repudiation was possible.

The long-planned World Disarmament Conference had been sitting in Geneva since early 1932 without much achievement to its credit. The German delegation took the position that according to the treaty German disarmament was to be only a prelude to world disarmament. They insisted that since the rest of the nations had done nothing important about disarming, Germany was entitled to build up her forces to a level of equality with her peers. In October, 1933 Hitler took his first majority step in foreign policy. On the 14th he withdrew his delegation from the already doomed Disarmament Conference and announced Germany's resignation from the League of Nations. It would be hard to think of a sharper

reversal of the Stresemann policy. The following month, Hitler asked the German nation by plebiscite, if it approved of these two steps, and 96·3 per cent voted yes.

The culmination of Hitler's attack on the military clauses of Versailles came on March 16th 1935, when he simply abrogated them unilaterally.

Creation of "Wehrmacht" (Germany's Armed Forces)

Hitler embarked on the same day (March 16th 1935) upon pre-war policy of the conscription of all young men, who now had to spend a year in the armed forces. To show the change in spirit he even altered the name of the army from the Weimar word *Reichwehr* to the new *Wehrmacht*.

The following months were hectic for the army high command. It is not an easy matter to transform an army from one hundred thousand to six hundred thousand men almost overnight. The logistic problem is a tremendous one, to say nothing of the problem of training so many raw recruits simultaneously. It is a testimony of the organisational skill of the *Fuhrer* that the enlargement of the defence forces and all that it involves were taken up with alacrity and Germany fast became an armed camp.

Remilitarization of the Rhineland

Almosst exactly a year after the return of conscription Hitler took his next big military step. He took advantage of the fact that Europe was in the midst of a crisis in international affairs, the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. On March 7th 1936, he repudiated another part of the Treaty of Versailles and the entire Locarno system by announcing the remilitarization of the Rhineland area to the Belgian and French frontiers. The Allies had ended their occupation of this territory in 1930. "This was a very daring step ; it touched France at her most sensitive spot. The Germans were aware of their daring, but received no French opposition. Once again Hitler had gambled and won."

Economic and Social Aspects

Problem of unemployment. It is undeniable that the promise which won Hitler the most votes in the black depression days was to end unemployment. The figure of six million unemployed was frightening. This was a challenge which had to be met immediately, and the Nazi government did not allow the grass to grow under its feet.

The astonishing fact is that in a very short period the promise was redeemed and Germany approached full employment. However, this statement must be hedged about with qualifications in view of methods used to achieve the goal.

Certain classes of society (e.g. Jews, Communists, etc.) were debarred from holding certain sort of jobs, and in many cases positions were created for jailors to control those unfortunate sections of the population in concentration camps. Every effort was made to remove women from employment ; there was no element of feminism in Nazism, which instead preached a traditional social order dominated by males.

In any time of unemployment one of the groups to suffer most is that composed of young men who have just completed their education and cannot find jobs. The Nazis took care of these people by creating the Labour Service (*Arbeitsdienst*). All young men were required to spend six months in camps in the countryside working on such projects as reclamation of land, prevention of erosion, etc., which were allegedly non-competitive with private industry. After 1935 they then spent their period of conscription in the armed forces, an effective method of keeping them out of the labour market.

Finally, the new impetus given to normal industrial production by rearmament, road building, and public works further lessened the number of unemployed.

Not only was challenge of unemployment met but that Germany enjoyed a boom period in the mid-thirties. The industrial plant that had been built during the Weimar years was now producing for Hitler and the Nazis. Credit was extended freely and the production figures mounted steadily.

Germans had lost their freedom ; they had exchanged it for a sort of economic security that had been lost during the depression.

Achievement of Self-Sufficiency

The economic goal of the Nazis was the achievement of autarky or self-sufficiency. They deplored the earlier dependence of Germany on other nations and resolved at all costs to be self-sufficient. Yet there was no denying the difficulty of the problem. For one thing, Germany was not overly endowed with natural resources except for coal. Since the heavy emphasis on production was on capital goods rather than consumer goods, it was obvious that Germany had to import huge amounts of raw materials. Furthermore, because the government was always conscious of the likelihood of war, there would have to be large-scale stock-piling of strategic materials. These needs raised different problems of financing and payment.

It was however impossible to get credits from abroad, and imports more than ever exceeded exports. It was consequently found necessary not only to restrict imports to bare essentials but to subsidize exports out of the proceeds of increased taxation in an effort to restore the balance. Meanwhile, as a means of diminishing the need of raw materials, much attention was paid to the making of synthetic products, such as substitutes for oil, wool, and rubber.

In 1934, the government arbitrarily suspended all interest on foreign debts, and as the supply of gold was extremely meagre and the monetary system far from stable, Germany paid for her imports of goods and raw material very largely by means of barter.

The Financial Wizardry of Schacht

The intricacies of German finance are sometimes beyond the layman's comprehension. But the fact remains that by devising a number of novel expedients an attempt was successfully made to overcome financial difficulties which appeared unsurmountable. The credit for this fact goes to

Hjalmar Schacht who is aptly called "Financial Wizard". Shortly after he assumed power Hitler reappointed Schacht to his old position as president of the Reichsbank, and some months later, minister of economics. It was in these positions that Schacht maintained his reputation of financial wizardry by devising a number of novel expedients.

Schacht established to strict control of all German currency and international trade. No one could take out of Germany more than ten marks without special permission. No one could import anything without approval. Every possible effort was made to increase German holdings of foreign exchange ; exports were increased as much as possible, tourists were encouraged to visit Germany by granting them extremely favourable rates for money brought outside, and foreign firms were required not to remove their assets from Germany but to spend them there.

Germans Themselves Carried a Large Share of the Burden

Naturally enough, the people were required to make immense sacrifices to achieve self-sufficiency. For an example, fine warm clothes of British wool had to be sacrificed. These sacrifices were glorified by the Nazis as a heroic effort by such slogans as "guns before butter" or "*Gemeinnutz Uber Eigennutz*" ("the general good before the individual good"). Only an autocratic government could venture to exact so much material sacrifice.

Social Changes

One of the most important influences on youth is the educational system. The Nazis took time by the forelock in bringing about sweeping changes in the educational system. Emphasis was now placed on the indoctrination of youth, the reservoir of the future party. This action had important implications because it brought the party squarely into conflict with the churches, which had always been an important influence on education. However, it was too basic a matter for the Nazis to neglect. They had to achieve an education in Germany which would be technically competent but also

nationalistically German and ideologically Nazi". Therefore a purge of teachers and curricular was high on the party agenda. Jews, Communists, and socialists were dismissed out of hand and replaced by "clean" German racial type. The text books and curricula were revised to present the Nazi outlook in its entirety. "The crucifix on the wall of a Catholic classroom was replaced by a photograph of the *Fuhrer*."

From the lowest grades in the schools to upward through the universities subservience to a superior heroism in war (lauded as the greatest of all virtues) and an unquestioning faith in the superior qualities of the Nordic race of the German people in particular were pounded into German youth.

Even the austere and aloof German universities felt the impact of National Socialism. They had always been corporate bodies supported by the state but sacrosanct in their autonomous self government. The faculties actually ran their institutions and elected their own *Rektoren* ("presidents"). This happy arrangement had to end, the *Fuhrerprinzip* ("principle of leadership") was to prevail. Despite some resistance from the professors, the ministry of education appointed new officials. Jews and opponents of the regime were either dismissed or resigned voluntarily and in many cases left Germany to the immense advantage of their adopted homes.

Probably the most appealing single act in the muzzling of leaning in Nazi Germany was the famous burning of books in the courtyard of the once-great University of Berlin in late 1933 while students danced around the pyre waving swastika flags and singing Nazi songs, hundreds of banned books from the university library were consumed by flames. It is hard to imagine a longer step in the return to barbarity.

Other classes of society were watched and guided at every step just as much as the youth.

III. Religious and Cultural Aspects

The Nazi ideology had one possible rival, and that was the Christian religion. Christianity was the greatest challenge the Nazis had to face in their effort to eradicate it in Germany

or at least to subjugate it to their general world outlook. They were attacking the deeply spiritual, traditional values, ingrained for over a thousand years, of a people which had shown itself profoundly religious and willing to fight for its faith. The French and Russian revolutionists could claim with some justification that the churches which they fought were corruptly allied with an evil old regime. This was not the case in Germany, where the churches had not been intimately affiliated with the Weimar system.

There was, however, no possibility of co-existence between the two ideologies for they were poles apart in their whole purpose and function. Christianity is a total way of life, based on supernatural authority and dedicated to a charitable brotherhood of man which transcends all political and racial frontiers. Nazism also was a total ideology, based on faith in the *Fuhrer* and geared to a brotherhood of only Germans and "Aryans", with contempt and violence for all others.

There was thus no meeting place between the two ideologies. Christianity was anathema to all the most orthodox National Socialists. Hitler had once called humanitarianism "a compound of stupidity, cowardice and arrogance". Then the fact that Jesus was a Jew gave the Nazis additional grounds for detesting the doctrines he had taught. A conflict between Christianity and Nazism was inevitable.

It follows therefore that both Catholics and Protestants should feel the heavy weight of the government's hand. Catholic schools and youth organisations were suppressed, and fines and terms of imprisonment were frequently inflicted on Catholic clergy for alleged violations of the law. The various Protestant Churches, which had united under the name "the German Evangelical Church Union", tried to retain some independence, but were forced to submit to a bishop, who, foisted upon them by Hitler, ruled them practically as a dictator. Hundreds of Protestant ministers were thrown into prison for resistance to his policy of "co-ordination". "Nowhere in the world at any epoch was nationa-

lism as a religion so systematically engendered. Well might the outside world stand aghast at such a phenomenon”.

Persecution of the Jews

It is almost too heart-rending to narrate the tragic story of the Jews in Nazi Germany, surely one of the sorriest pages in the annals of humanity.

From the moment of the Nazi accession to power, the persecution of the Jews began. Jews were dismissed from all governmental or teaching posts and gradually from the learned professions and important business positions. Jewish-owned firms were seized and “Aryanized”. On April 1st, 1933, there was a one day boycott of all Jewish firms. The concentration camps, hurriedly constructed, started to fill; synagogues (Jewish places of worship) were burned and plate-glass windows broken. Elderly Jews were exposed to all sorts of indignities, such as being forced to clean the streets with their tongues while gangs of “Aryan” hoodlums jeered at them. Placards and signs made it clear that there would be little or no punishment for attacks on Jews. The visitor to Germany became woefully used to signs on park benches stating that Jews might not sit there, to anti-Semitic exhibitions of pornographic hideousness, and to slogans painted on fences saying: “The Jew is the enemy of the world” or “Who kills a Jew does a good deed”.

As Hitler became less and less considerate of foreign opinion, more stringent measures—the so called Nuremberg Laws of (September 15, 1935)—were enacted. A Jew was defined as anyone with one Jewish grand-parent. He was no longer a German citizen, could not vote, had no civil rights, might not marry an Aryan (here Hitler was concerned with the purity of Aryan race!), could not fly the German flag nor teach nor take part in the arts, and did not even have the rights of a serf, but was the plaything and victim of his venomous masters. The policy knocked at Jewish door in the dead of night and removed the inhabitants. The entire period from 1933 to 1945 was a long passion for the Jewish people, a programme without relaxation. The only fortunate

Jews were those who managed to escape from the country with the help from abroad and only the clothes on their backs.

The climax of oppression was finally reached in November, 1938 when the enormous fine of a billion marks (over 400,000,000 dollars) was imposed on the Jewish population as vengeance for the murder of a German official in Paris by a Jewish lad who had been crazed by the persecution of his father. In addition to the fine, a wave of intense fanaticism swept Germany against the Jews resulting in beating and sadism which knew no bounds.

Comments on the Persecution of the Jews

As the Jews were less than one per cent of the total population and were in no sense a military danger, there was no possible excuse of political necessity for such oppression, and the chief explanation is race hatred. But atmosphere of terror which such violence produced had a notable effect in strengthening an attitude of sub-servience towards the Nazis. It would seem that conscience itself had been paralyzed along with political freedom.

Cultural Activities under the Nazis

Hitler considered himself an authority in the fine arts as in every other walk of life. The *Fuhrer's* taste ran to the conventional and banal. He disapproved of almost everything that had happened in the world of art since Edouard Manet (1832-83),¹ labelling modern art degenerate. In fact, he organized an exhibit of "degenerate" art in Munich as a warning to the people, but had to close it permanently when it drew far longer crowds than the nearby showing of orthodox German art.

1. Manet and his associates abandoned the classical emphasis in painting on studied form. Being concerned above all with registering an immediate impression of transient beauty they depicted refraction and reflections of light and shade. They were regarded as rebels by the orthodox critics.

The Nazis undertook great projects of public works, building government offices, stadiums, art galleries, housing developments, etc. Hitler concerned himself personally in the architectural designs for these, picking Albert Speer as his favourite assistant. Typical were the enormous stadiums and meeting halls built on the outskirts of Nuremburg for the annual party congresses. They were massive, plain, and dull. Munich, the "capital city of the movement", received unadorned buildings to house the party offices and archives and two simple but awkward temples for the coffins of the men who were killed in the beer hall *Putsch* in 1923 and resulting in the imprisonment of Hitler.

By and large the Nazi period was barren in respect of artistic and spiritual creation. Most of the creative minds of the Weimar years fled abroad or lived in quiet obscurity. The Nazi period in this respect was "a dull, drab, and sterile time".

The Nazi state was police state. The degree of control by terror achieved by the Nazis probably exceeded anything ever known in history. The infamous Gestapo (*Geheime Staats Polizei*, "secret state police") was the principal organ of the terror.

The Nazis set up a strict censorship and forbade the printing of any material not completely in accord with their ideology. Newspapers, radio, and motion pictures gave the public only what the Nazis prescribed. It was a serious punishable offence to listen to broadcasts from a foreign country over short-wave radio. Germans lived in a sealed cocoon to the extent that a powerful government was able to enforce its will.

The foreign policy of Hitler

As already stated his major objective was to rid Germany of the evil effects of the humiliating Treaty of Versailles. To begin with he fooled the European nations and pretended to be anxious for peace while he was always preparing for war. He violated the treaty of Versailles by refusing to pay the war indemnity. He began the territorial expansion and

fortification of Germany. The valley of Saar which had been handed over to France by the Treaty of Versailles was taken over by Germany as a result of a referendum. In 1935 he captured Rhineland. He entered into a non-aggression agreement with Poland for a ten years period. In 1936 he also signed a treaty with Italy and created the Rome Berlin axis and it was joined by Japan in 1937. Europe was now on the verge of being divided into hostile groups. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis which was aimed at communism really became a military alliance for aggression.

In 1937 Hitler renounced the guilt clause of the Treaty of Versailles. In 1938 he succeeded in a Coup D'etat in Austria and seized Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. In 1939 he dismembered the rest of Czechoslovakia and seized Memel from Lithuania and invaded Poland.

In Poland the Germans enlisted the support of traitors within the country. After twenty eight days of determined resistance the Poles surrendered. Their allies had failed them in the hour of need. Hitler's conquest of Poland was a fitting reply to the British government's policy of appeasement. Chamberlain the British Prime Minister, had imagined that he had provided "peace for our time" by signing the Munich agreement. How false his hopes were to be proved! Only six months later in violation of the Munich Pact, Hitler had gobbled up Czechoslovakia.

After the German attack on Poland, England and France decided to challenge Germany and declared war on 3rd September 1939. In November, Russia attacked Finland and followed it by attacks on Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania. Germany helped her to take over a portion of Rumania. The Second world war had thus commenced.

In April 1940, the Nazis took over Denmark and then Norway and Sweden were attacked. In May, the same year, Germany attacked Holland and Belgium. In the battle of Dunkirk the English suffered a stunning defeat.

In June 1940 France fell. The fall of France was a rude shock.

On June 22 1941, Hitler who signed a no aggression pact with Russia invaded the country without giving reasons.

This only added to the list of violations of treaties and pacts by Hitler.

After a gigantic struggle, which had singleness of purpose and great determination the British, Russians and Americans succeeded in turning the tables on Hitler and the year 1945 turned out to be a year of victory. In that year Berlin was captured, Hitler committed suicide and Germany unconditionally surrendered. History had moved full circle. It had seen the rise and fall of Hitler and the dominance of Nazis.

Nationalism and Militarism in Japan (1928-1941)—A historical background of its rise and growth.

Nippon (the Land of the Rising Sun) is a group of islands with an area of 147,060 square miles—that is, equal to that of Poland or Finland and about 50% greater than that of Britain and about 1/13th the size of India prior to 1947 and a population almost 50 per cent more than that of Britain. The people were organised under a feudal society with an Emperor (Mikado) at the top and who was supposed to have been descended from the Sun God and has thus, been for centuries a sacred figure head. The real power was vested in the Shogun. He was like the Peshwa of the Maratha State in India in the eighteenth century. The office of the Shogun (Shogunate) became hereditary in certain dynasties and the last of these, the Tokugama ruled Japan from the later years of the seventeenth century until 1867. Below the Shoguns were the Daimios, great feudal barons who governed the provinces and were supported by the Samurai—a military caste. This feudal aristocracy absolutely dominated the mass of the Japanese people.

Like China, Japan maintained its isolation for centuries. It was penetrated by the Portuguese discoveror, Pinto in 1542. He was followed by Christian missionaries, the chief of whom was Francis Xavier, a Jesuit priest. Before the end of the century they had gained many thousands of converts. But a reaction, largely caused by the interference of the Christian bishops beyond their proper sphere, led, to a series of awful massacres of the missionaries and their converts. In 1638 the Shoguns finally reverted to a policy of isolation even more rigid than that of China, which was maintained until the mid-

nineteenth century. Only the Dutch were allowed a single trading post and a strictly regulated commerce.

This isolation was brusquely interrupted in 1853, when an American fleet, under Commodor Perry, suddenly anchored off Yedo, the Shogun's capital, and on behalf of the Government of the United States demanded redress for the cruel treatment of the crews of American whaling ships which had from time to time been cast on the Japanese coast. He demanded that such ships should have access to one or more Japanese ports, to refill, get provisions, and dispose off cargoes. A debate followed between Shogun and the Daimios. Some advocated complete abstention from all dealings with foreigners; but a majority decided to open relations with them in order to acquire the secret of their superior power. So in 1854 two ports were opened to American ships. Thus the isolation of Japan was ended by force twelve years after that of China. In contrast with China, however, the transformation of Japan during the next half century has been the most astonishing phenomenon of the modern world.

The Japanese Revolution (1867) "The Restoration."

The treaty of 1854 was the work of the Shogun, but it resulted in his overthrow by the conservative section of the Daimios, who supported the offended Mikado against the usurper. A civil war ensued, during which the people gave the reins to their hatred and contempt of foreign intruders. An Englishman was murdered in 1862 and a British fleet promptly bombarded Kagoshima. This and a similar action and reaction at Shimonoseki in 1864 deeply impressed the conservative Daimios, who now became keen supporters of the policy of the "open door". The Shogun died in 1867 and the Mikado a few months latter. The last Shogunate was abolished. The new Mikado, Mutsuhito abandoned his hieratic seclusion at Kyoto in 1868, occupied the Shogun's capital, Yedo, which was now renamed Tokyo, that is "Capital of the East", and became once more the real ruler of Japan.

An amazing revolution immediately followed. The Daimios and the Samurai voluntarily abandoned the feudal privileges

which they had enjoyed for eight centuries. From 1853 Japan “began to run after Western ideas as fast as she could”. The European system, military, naval, administrative, industrial and educational, was adopted with surprising rapidity and completeness and in a quarter of a century Japan became equal to a first class European power, as she quickly demonstrated in the field of power politics.

The stupendous transformation was made possible by certain qualities which the Japanese reveal as strongly today, their intense and disciplined patriotism, reinforced by an absolutist feudal tradition, which is deeper than the thin veneer of democratic constitutionalism with which it was overlaid in 1890; their remarkable powers of assimilation, and the arrogant self-confidence of a physically sturdy race, which for centuries has accepted with pride the domination of a militarist caste. They were and are convinced that they are innately superior to all foreigners and that, having acquired the weapons of the foreigners they will demonstrate that superiority and harvest its material results. Thus the Minister for War, General Araki, declared in July, 1932: “The spirit of the Japanese Nation is, by its nature, a thing that must be propagated over the seven seas and extended over the five continents. Anything that may hinder its progress must be abolished, even by force.”

Without describing this process of modernization in detail, it may be mentioned that the European calendar was introduced in 1873, and shortly afterwards a complete system of law and judicial procedure, modelled upon a comparative study of those of Europe was introduced. Public compulsory education was introduced only two years after Gladstone's Education Act of 1870. Universities and technical schools were founded under State supervision. Foreign teachers were invited to the country; in 1884 English was introduced as a second language into schools. In 1890 a constitution, prepared after eight years' comparative study, was promulgated. It established a Parliament of two chambers, a House of Peers and a House of Representatives. The suffrage was granted to all men over twenty five years, who paid direct taxes amounting at first to

about twenty rupees and later to about thirteen rupees. But great prerogatives were reserved to the Emperor, and real political power still reclined, as in Bismarck's German Empire, in a conservative aristocracy.

The reality and extent of this revolution was perhaps most fully appraised by Britain, which in 1894 admitted Japan to the comity of nations, voluntarily forgoing her extra-territorial rights, recognizing Japan, in short, as a great modern state.

The Sino-Japanese War (1894-95)

In 1894 a quarrel between Japan and China concerning the suzerainty over the "hermit kingdom" of Cho-sen (Korea), which each claimed, resulted in a war. Japan achieved a rapid and crushing victory. By the Treaty of Shimonoseki (April 1st, 1895) a humiliated China was forced to accept the Japanese terms; to recognize the independence of Korea (which the Japanese had marked for annexation in due time), to cede Formosa, the Liaotung peninsula, and the Pescadores or Liukiu islands, and to pay a heavy indemnity. At this point Russia intervened.

Russia in the Far East

The Russian government, at enmity with the British in the Near and Middle East, was perturbed by the result of the Anglo-Chinese War of 1839-42 (the so-called "Opium War" and particularly by the British acquisition of the commercially and strategically valuable island of Hong Kong. So the able and forceful Muraviev was despatched in 1847 to initiate a forward policy in the Far East. In the course of the next thirteen years he pushed the Russian frontiers to the Korean border and founded the naval port of Vladivostok ("Master of the East"). Russia now half encircled Manchuria. Further pressure resulted in 1875 in the acquisition of the island of Sakhalin, of which for a time the Russians had shared the possession with Japan.

Provided with an abundance of French loan money which was part of the price of the Franco-Russian Alliance of

1893-94—the Russian government in 1891 began to construct the Trans-Siberian railway, which was intended to terminate at Vladivostok and was already approaching the Manchurian border when the Japanese overwhelmed China in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95).

The “Three Power Intervention” (1895)

Russia, rebuffed in Europe, was unwilling to see a great sphere of expansion in the Far East controlled by the upstart Japan. “The Japanese”, said Labanov, “would spread like a drop of oil on blotting paper”. So Russia persuaded her new ally, France, and also Germany, to support her in depriving Japan of the Liat-tung peninsula and its valuable ice-free harbour, Port Arthur. “In the cause of peace and amity” and on the ground that “the possession of the peninsula of Liao-tung would be a constant menace to the capital of China, would render illusory the independence of Korea and would henceforth be a perpetual obstacle to the permanent peace of the Far East”. The Russian government advised Japan “to renounce the possession of Liaotung”. Japan accepted the advice under duress.

The Scramble for Concessions

Having apparently frustrated the Japanese, the Russian government proceeded to extend the Trans-Siberian railway to Vladivostok and to negotiate with Li Hung Chang, the subtle minister of the Empress's Dowager of China, for authority to exploit Manchuria. In 1896 the Russo Chinese Bank was established, largely by means of French capital, to enable the Chinese government to pay the war indemnity. In return for this service Russia was to receive railway and telegraph concessions in Manchuria. So the Chinese Eastern Railway Company was formed, which built a railway across Manchuria from China through Harbin to Vladivostok.

Germany's seizure of Kaio-chau

Meanwhile an anti-foreign riot in Shantung resulted in the murder of two German missionaries on November 1st, 1897.

Ten days later four German cruisers entered the harbour of Kaio-chau and proclaimed it a German possession. After some negotiation the German government obtained from China, by way of compensation for the murder, a ninety-nine years' lease of Kaiochau and the right to link it with the Chinese railway system. "We need a door into China", said Marshall Von Bieberstein, the Foreign Minister. A naval squadron was despatched, under the command of the Kaiser's brother, Prince Henry of Prussia, to enforce Germany's demands, and upon the eve of its departure the Kaiser advised his brother in the course of a famous speech, "Should any one attempt to affront us or infringe our just rights, then strike with a manled fist". Germany built at Kaisochau the strong fortress of Tsingtao.

Russia's Demands

The Russian government promptly followed up the German coup by demanding and obtaining from China a twenty five years lease of the end of Haio Tung peninsula including the valuable ice-free harbours of Port Luther and Daisen (Dalny), the rights to connect them with the Chinese Eastern Railway at Harbin and to maintain military and railwayguards along these lines as well as mineral and timber concessions. So Manchuria was occupied and garrisoned as if it were a Russian province.

Britain's take-over of Weihourser.

Port Arthur had been used occasionally as anchorage for the British China fleet but when the British government protested against its aberration to Russia, the Russian government produced a secret agreement which had been obtained from China giving Russia a prior and exclusive claim. Britain then obtained from China a lease of the port of Weitaiwe as a point of support in North China.

Japan had been frustrated by an irresistible combination of Great Powers. She accordingly formed with Great Britain in 1902 an alliance, which was periodically renewed until 1922, when it was denounced by Britain as having fulfilled its purpose.

The Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905)

Protected by the Alliance with Britain, Japan demanded the withdrawal of Russia from Liao-tung and Manchuria. When the Russian government equivocated, Japan declared War in February 1904. Britain "kept the ring"; Japan decisively defeated Russia and by the Treaty of Portsmouth (U.S.A.), August 1905, forced her to give up Liao-tung and her ice-free harbour of Port Arthur and to retrocede the southern portion of the island of Sakhalin, which she had seized in 1875. Both powers engaged to evacuate Manchuria which was restored to China, but Cho-sen (Korea) was recognized as a Japanese protectorate. Five years later Japan annexed Korea.

From this time, strong in her own strength, in her remoteness from the other Great Powers, and in her alliance with Britain, she openly regarded China as a field of exploitation.

Significance of the Russo-Japanese War

The War resulted in the defeat of the Occidental giant, Russia, by the Oriental dwarf, Japan—a case of David overthrowing Goliath. (I. Samuel XVII. Heb.) It was a tremendous and shattering blow to the prestige of the Russian Bear.

In Russia, in Japan, in China, in Europe also, the Russo-Japanese War produced important consequences. It checked for a time the Far Eastern advance of Russia, and recalled her once again to the Balkans and Near Eastern affairs. Inside Russia it precipitated the internal revolution which had been brewing.

"To Japan the result of the war had been a matter of life and death. Had she been defeated, her ambitions, her previous achievements, her whole policy, would have been ruined. Her victory gave her the succession to Russia in South Manchuria, an immense prestige, and a special position in relation to China, it gave her the lead in the Far East. From that date she entered openly into competition and rivalry with the European Powers in China, and embarked upon a blatant Imperialism which led her to annex Korea in 1910, to seize

Seantung, and put forward the "Twenty-one Demands" during the great War, and generally to enunciate theories and conceive a policy which have made her the supreme problem of the Pacific entanglement.

"In China the war gave a double impetus, on the one side to the Western nations who resumed, with Japan as their serious rival, the struggle for opportunities and powers, who wrangled over railways and loans, who struggled to outdo each other, until once again they were forced to a policy of co-operation as the only alternative to a mutual destruction. On the other hand it gave a profound impetus to the awakening of China. Ten years before the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 together with the International scramble for concessions, had led to the Boxer riots; the Russo-Japanese War and the second period of European encroachments received its answer in the Chinese Revolution of 1911".

Japanese Imperialism (1914-18)

When the World War broke out in 1914, Japan rapidly became the dominant power in the Far East. Her first action was as an ally of Britain, to declare war on Germany on August 23, 1914. She captured the strong German fortress of Tsingtao, occupied Kaiochau and Shantung and seized the German islands in the northern Pacific Ocean.

The "Twenty-one Demands" (1915)

Although China, like Japan, had declared war on the Central European Powers, the Japanese government in January 1915, presented to the Chinese President, Yuan Shih Kai, one of the most extraordinary documents in the history of the Far East, the famous "Twenty-one Demands", which amounted to a military, political and financial protectorate.*

*The "Twenty-one Demands" consisted of five groups. The first group related to Shantung, the second to Manchuria and Eastern Inner Mongolia, the third to certain coal and iron concessions, the fourth was a simple and comprehensive demand for the non alienation of all Chinese gulfs, harbours, and coasts, and the fifth, consisting of six articles, demanded the appointment of Japanese advisers, the purchase of Japanese muni-

The Chinese Government was obliged to yield** and the Allied Powers to acquiesce.

Langsing-Ishii Agreement

In November, 1917, the government of United States of America by this Agreement formally recognized that "territorial propinquity" gave Japan "special interests" in China. In other words, the United States was committed to the Japanese claim upon Shantung.

Taking the fullest advantage of the preoccupation of all the other Great Powers, Japan gained complete control of China and established a military occupation and administration of Manchuria, Shantung, and Inner Mongolia in the north and Fukien in the south. Moreover, upon the outbreak of the Russian Revolution her troops, in co-operation with American forces, occupied the whole of Siberia east of Lake Baikal, including the island of Sakhalin, and showed their intention of retaining permanently at least the whole of maritime Siberia.

Japan and China at the Peace Conference of Paris (1919)

At the Peace Conference Shantung was the main bone of contention between Japan and China. The former naturally wanted to gobble it, while the latter demanded its restoration to her. China besides demanded the abolition of extra-territoriality and tariff autonomy, the cancellation of foreign 'spheres of influence' the withdrawal of foreign troops, foreign postal and telegraph offices, of foreign concessions. On all sides China received only disappointment. With regard to Shantung Britain, France and Italy were already pledged to support Japan; President Wilson, who declared himself ignorant of

tions, the privilege of religious propaganda, police control and an economic preference, amounting in Fukein (province of China on the China Sea) to practical dominance.

**Pressure of two kinds was brought upon Yuan Shih Kai to accept the "Demands". In the first place was offered 'promotion', political support for his own imperial schemes: in the second he was threatened with war.

the Langsingt-Ishii agreement, was induced to cast his vote on the same side by Japan's threat to stand out from the League of Nations if she were not satisfied.

So the German rights in Shantung went to Japan. The other demands of China were put aside as not relevant to the discussion. The Chinese delegates departed practically empty-handed, refusing to sign the Treaty, and China, outwitted and betrayed, gave herself over in bitterness to a more violent nationalism.

Post-War Japan

After the War the Japanese had no political friends—The Japanese had over reached themselves during the Great War, and had earned the profound distrust of the victorious Allies. Moreover the Soviet Russians had by 1922 re-established themselves in maritime Siberia, which Britain, the United States of America, and France forced the Japanese to abandon, as well as their territorial aim in Shantung. In 1922 the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was superseded by a Quadruple Alliance between Britain, the U.S.A., France, and Japan. In the same year Japan was compelled to agree to the Nine-Power Treaty (between the U.S.A., Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, the Netherlands and Portugal), which professed to guarantee the territorial integrity of China and the commercial principle of "the open door". This was, on Paper, a negation of her 1915 treaty with China and of her actual position in respect of that unhappy country. In 1922 also Japan reluctantly agreed to the Naval Pact by which she accepted the 3:5:5 ratio of tonnage in relation to Britain and the United States of America. In 1925 the Maritime Province of Siberia and the northern half of Sakhalin were formally restored to the U.S.S.R.

Plutocratic sway in Japan—Japan had now become, nevertheless, the third greatest Power in the world, wholly bent upon the military and commercial domination of the Far East. A patriotic and highly disciplined population of nearly seventy millions, united in their sacred allegiance to the Mikado, was organized under the political control of two

great groups, the Seiyukai, which represented a militarist aristocracy with an ancient tradition of feudal authority ; and Minseito, which represented organized plutocracy. It has been estimated that eight families* controlled one quarter of Japan's wealth and completely dominated her industry, commerce and finance.

Japan's occupation of Manchuria—Meanwhile confusion grew worse confounded in republican China, which by the end of 1929 threatened complete disruption. In 1930, however, Chiang Kai Shek with the assistance of the "Young Marshal" defeated a combination of Mongolian "war lords". But his further progress was halted by the Japanese. The Manchurian pear was ripe for plucking. Seizing upon an "incident" they occupied Manchuria in 1931, declared a protectorate, and in March 1932, proclaimed it the state of Manchukuo, placing the Manchu, Henry Pu Yi, on the throne as a puppet emperor.

Manchuria became an International Issue, Dilatoriness of the League of Nations—The Chinese appeal to the League of Nations—from which Japan shortly afterwards gave the requisite two years' notice of withdrawal—was futile. The action of the League was dilatory and impotent. The Chinese Government invoked its intervention on September 21st, 1931. The Council appointed the Lytton Commission in January 1932. The Commission, after spending ten months in investigation, tendered a report unfavourable to Japan and suggested among other things, that Manchuria should be considered autonomous state under Chinese rule. With only one dissenting vote (that of Japan) the Assembly of the League, to which the matter had been referred, unanimously approved the report. But nothing was done to implement it. The Japanese had annexed Manchuria despite International guarantees and the unanimous opposition of the League. From that time the authority of the League of Nations as an International arbiter declined lamentably, until in the Italo-Ethiopian conflict Signor Mussolini administered what proved a *coup de grace*

*Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Asano, Sumitoma, Shibusawa, Suzuki, Okura and Yasuda.

a (finishing blow) to its principles in the realm of "real policy"

Anti-Japanese Stance in China

The steady expansion of a naked-military control of China by the Japanese provoked intense hatred. Chiang Kai Shek was strangely passive towards the Japanese; but nation-wide anti-Japanese propaganda and boycott, and the frequent recurrence of "incidents" led to a destructive Japanese bombardment, in February 1932, of the forts and settlements immediately north of Shanghai and a Japanese military occupation of the area, from which they withdrew in May only after protracted International Negotiation.

Political Effects of the Economic Blizzard of 1929-31

Meanwhile the economic depression, which rapidly enveloped the world in 1930, produced a two-fold political effect : (i) it sharply emphasized the division of the Great Powers into two groups, the "haves"—Britain, United States of America, France, and perhaps Russia—and the "have nots", which included Italy, Germany, and Japan. Incidentally the "haves" were the democratic nations. (ii) It provoked a mood of militant extremism in the "have not" nations; exacerbated them against the democratic "haves", and fostered the militarist section and the policy of aggression.

Nationalism and the Rise of Militarism and Fascism in Japan

Truly asserts Yanaga, "The contact with the nineteenth century nationalism of the West made possible the development of a modern nationalism, more intense than the vague sort of nationalism which had obtained throughout the feudal period".

The year 1901 witnessed the birth of a new ultra-nationalist society—"The Black Dragon Society"—which was devoted to the promotion of domestic reforms and overseas expansion. Ultrationalism had its advocates even among University Professors. Two of them namely Uestugi Shinkichi and Kakehi Katsuhiko established the Paulownia Society to promote

patriotism and counteracting the evil effects of liberalism. With democracy becoming popular during the first World War efforts were made to check the growth of militarism and to free the workers from oppression and exploitation. Even the Zaibatsu made large scale contributions to the political parties to overthrow the military and to keep in check those rightist organisations which were supporting the military with the principles of chauvinism. They left no stone unturned in order to discredit and demolish the military. To achieve their objective they even enlisted the support of labourers and peasants.

To counteract this, the Black Dragon Society, condemned democracy and liberal movements as Un-Japanese. In 1908 the Rominkai was started and it became the focal point for anti-democratic and anti-socialist activities.

In 1918 the nationalist Rosokai was organised by Dr. Okawa Shumei, Professor Mitsukawa Kametaro and others with the avowed object of devoting itself entirely to the problem of the reconstruction of the Nation. Though opposed to Marxism, Okawa and Mitsukawa were impressed with the work Kita Ikki—History of the Chinese Revolution—and brought him back from Shanghai and started a new society Yuzonsha and was concerned mainly with propaganda. This combination worked till 1923 when Okawa and Kita broke up and became formidable rivals.

In his work "Outline for the Reconstruction of Japan", Kita proposed the reconstruction of the nation around the military and enlightened citizens. An important part of his plan was to strengthen Japan's military power as a means of establishing international justice. This work which was published in 1919 became the bible of the ultranationalists, both civilian and military and exercised a tremendous influence on the period of the thirties.

The Japan Nationalist Society was formed in 1919 and coordinated its activities with that of Rominkai. It was followed in 1922 with the League for the Prevention of Communism. It championed the cause of Imperial rule and observed the first "Patriotic Day". In pursuit of its programme, it even resorted to force in dealing with the anarchists. The year 1923 witnessed the birth of three more nationalist organi-

sations. The summer of 1923 witnessed the creation of National Association for the Study of the Military Affairs. Its aim was to spread and popularise military ideas and knowledge and for the promotion of nationalism.

In order to direct national thought in the right direction, the Cherry Blossom Society was formed. It was a breakaway group of the Japan Nationalist Society. The Radical Youth Party on the other hand began publishing "Japanese Thought" for the spread and understanding of nationalist ideas.

The strength of the Nationalist movement was evident from the celebration of the Empire Foundation Day on Feb. 11th, 1926. Its corollary was the establishment of Empire Foundation Society. It aimed ultimately to the abolishment of Parliamentary System, political and proletarian parties because these were considered to be inconsistent with Japan's body politic.

"The reactionary character of the nationalistic movement" says Yanaga, "grew out of the highly irrational ultranationalism and chauvinistic patriotism, calling for free sacrifice of life, whenever necessary. Basically the movement was an emotional one, which appealed almost entirely to the sentiments of religious veneration of the Emperor".

Yanaga further adds that "In a sense, Japanese fascism was the manifestation of determined opposition against Western concepts of liberalism and socialism as well as communism and was directed against Western influences in general which were thought to threaten the pattern of Japanese life and culture to the detriment of national security. It was therefore authoritarian, antiparlimentarian, antidemocratic, opposed to disarmament and suspicious of the League of Nations. It was also a Pan Asiatic movement, unafraid and unhesitant regarding the use of force".

The economic difficulties were aggravated by the economic depression and the consequent financial panic. While the mass of the people were suffering untold hardships caused by widespread unemployment and agrarian difficulties, the political parties together with the Zaibatsu were indulging in corruption and nefarious activities. Scandal upon scandal caused serious damage to political parties and government.

The party government stood totally discredited. The public confidence was totally shaken if not completely destroyed. There was enough justification for the launching of antidemocratic, anti-parliamentary propaganda by the military and the right wing organisations. "The general public discontent at the existing state of affairs was too good an opportunity for the reactionaries to miss." (Yanaga).

No method of exposing the political parties and the Zaibatsu was spared and a rift was created between the public and the parties that be. In 1930 when the Navy Minister Admiral Takarabe came back from the London Naval Conference he was accused of having sold his country and was denounced as a traitor.

In September 1930 the Cherry Society was formed by a few officers. The society explained the degeneration of the military in terms of the decline in morale caused by peace and the lack of determination and direction among the officers. These officers were certain that what had happened to the Navy as a result of the London Naval Treaty was bound to happen to the army in the shape of some disarmament agreement in the near future.

The Cherry Society drew up a list of the ills that afflicted the nation. They were

- (1) Corrupt political parties and high ranking government officials;
- (2) Self-centred capitalists and nobility;
- (3) The pernicious influence of the media of mass communication;
- (4) Serious agrarian distress;
- (5) Economic depression and unemployment;
- (6) Existence of "Unhealthy thought organisations".;
- (7) The existence of a decadent culture;
- (8) The lack of patriotism of students;
- (9) The rapacity and greed of officials to safeguard their own positions and interests.

This amounted to an indictment of the government and the powers that be and in the circumstances it was the army that ought to undertake national reconstruction, for the government was ineffective and capable of doing nothing.

What was obviously required was a change in the composition of government so as to enable the group to bring about national reconstruction.

The Rise of Militarism and Fascism in Japan

In Japan, where military power had been developed out of proportion to the country's wealth, the militarists in 1930 violently assailed the Minseito Cabinet accusing it of a conspiracy with the plutocrats to exploit the depression in their interest. In November the Premier, Hamaguchi, was shot. In 1931 the radical elements of the army planned a coup d'état but it collapsed because of General Ugaki's change of mind. The plot known as the March Plot would have resulted in the blowing up of the Headquarters of the two major political parties, Seiyuki and Minseito and the residence of the Prime Minister. Troops were to surround the Diet building and cut off all possible communication with outside agencies.

Another group of disenchanted army officers created the Manchurian Incident on September 18, 1931. It was caused by the Kwantung Army. Following the Manchurian Incident appeared the October Plot. This Plot was planned by Lt. Generals Koiso and Tatekawa, Major General Nagata and Okawa Shumei. The coup which was to be carried out on October 24 was discovered by the gendarmerie a week earlier and the leaders of the plot arrested from their meeting place in Tokyo. The plot intended to wipe out the entire government while a cabinet meeting was going on at the Premier's official residence by means of an overall attack. Fleet Admiral Togo was to be sent to the Emperor that the "Newly Risen Power", be asked to form a government.

This was followed by the murder of Premier Inukai on May 15th, 1932. The affair brought to light the fact that the military was opposed to political parties. Two days after the cold blooded murder of Inukai it was revealed by the Newspapers that the Vice Chief of General Staff Mazaki Gendarmerie Commander in Chief Hata and some others had called on the War Minister and asked him to inform Prince Saionji that the armed forces were totally opposed to party government. Under the circumstances, Admiral Saito formed a

temporary non-party government. Though it was hoped that Party government would be restored when conditions were more congenial, yet it was not to be. It proved merely to be change from a party government to a non-party military dominated government. In fact the May 15th incident sounded the death knell of Party government. Two months after the Saito cabinet was formed, General Mato Nabuyoshi was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Kwantung Army, Governor General of Kwantung Territory and concurrently Ambassador to Manchukuo. The combining of military, administrative and diplomatic powers in one person was indicative of the direction in which the wind was blowing and also of the position that the military had come to occupy. Another plot to liquidate the Saito Cabinet was discovered on July 10, 1933 but it was disclosed only on September 16, 1935, more than two years latter. The trial which began in the Supreme Court on November 9th, 1937 ended on March 15th 1941 with all the forty four defendants being acquitted.

Admiral Saito's government was followed by the Okada Ministry in July 1934. These governments were fascist in temperament and policy but the civilian and industrial element continued to exercise some restraint upon the militarists. At the end of 1935 the moderate Admiral Saito became the personal adviser of the Emperor Mutsuhito. At the general election of February 1936, the Minseito party, which supported the Okada government, increased in strength; the small proletarian Shakai Taishuto party doubled its members; the Seiyukai and Fascist groups were correspondingly weakened. A military revolt was engineered before the end of the month. A group of young officers launched a well planned and pre-meditated attack on the offices of the newspaper Asahi and murdered Premier Okada, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, Admiral Saito, Inspector General of Military Education Watanabe and wounded Finance Minister Takahashi and Grand Chamberlain Admiral Suzuki. These young officers had launched their murdering attack in the belief that they could save the nation from impending disaster, which according to them was being brought about by the political parties, the Palace advisers, the Elder Statesmen, the Zaibatsu and the

administrators. On the 28th February 1936 the Public learnt the details of the plot. Premier Okada had a miraculous escape through a case of mistaken identity. In fact his brother-in-law Colonel Matsuo who had a striking resemblance had fallen victim. The Martial Law was imposed and all rail traffic into the capital was stopped and telephone connections with the outside world were suspended, in order to deal with the insurgents. After surrounding their hideout, General Kashii, the martial-law Commander in chief issued an ultimatum to the insurgents to surrender together with an appeal couched in language admonishing the troops and emphasising loyalty to the Emperor. The appeal worked and after four days of animated suspense the insurgents surrendered and the whole episode ended without a shot being fired. The trial was speedily carried out and only after 4 months the guilty had been punished. Colonel Aizawa was executed along with thirteen army officers and four civilians. What was disturbing was the fact that hitherto the attacks which had been directed against the palace advisers and party leaders had now been against the army itself for Inspector General of Military Education Watanabe had been killed. With the liquidation of the insurgents the army was now in full control of the State affairs. The assassins had been punished but the militarists controlled the situation.

Okada resigned and foreign Minister Hirota was nominated Premier—a political dark horse. While Hirota was trying to form a Cabinet, the War Minister made his position clear in no uncertain terms. Teranchi, the War Minister stated, “The New Cabinet, charged with the heavy responsibility of seeing the nation safely through the crisis, should possess both the spirit and the vigour to pursue strong positive policies and that it must not have liberal tendencies or continue to persist in negative and conservative policies and compromises which preserve the status quo. The renovation of national administration by means of positive policies is the army’s unanimous wish. Compromise and conservatism could not be the proper means by which to save the situation”. Hirota accepted all the demands of the army as also its conditions.

Seeing the direction in which the wind was blowing the Zaibatsu began to change its stance and the National Federation of Industrial Associations also began to soften its attitude to the army. The move towards fascism had begun and having realized that the political parties had become ineffective and forfeited public confidence and support, the Zaibatsu was inclined to support the army programme rather than struggle against it.

One single step that paved the way for the ascendancy of the military was the promulgation of the Imperial Ordinance No. 63 for the Army and No. 64 for the Navy dated May 1936. It restored the active status requirement of service ministers. It provided the army with a powerful weapon and the way for the eventual establishment of a totalitarian regime under its control. This very active status requirement was used to overthrow the Hirota government in January 1937. The Emperor then nominated the moderate General Ugaki as Premier but the Army refused to obey a government by politicians. Ugaki gave up asserting that the country was threatened with an aggressive military despotism. In February 1937 General Hayashi formed a government completely subservient to the Army. It may be noted that the seven point programme of national political renovation as announced by the Hirota Cabinet on August 25th, 1936 was only the army's blue-print about the Cabinets that followed.

Hamada Kunimatsu—the Seuyukai member launched a blistering attack on January 21st, 1937 the day the Diet assembled after the year end recess. He accused the army of installing themselves as the “propulsive power” of the Japanese body politic and pointed out that the people were not unaware of the political philosophy of the army that was encouraging dictatorial tendencies which threatened to destroy the amity and cooperation between the military and the people. This was obviously the last desperate effort by the political parties to check the rising tide of military power.

On March 31st, the last day of the Diet, Premier Hayashi dissolved the Diet and the election that followed saw the return with an absolute majority of the opposition parties.

The verdict of the people having gone against him, Hayashi Cabinet resigned on May 31st, 1937.

Hayashi was succeeded by Prince Konoe who was acceptable to all—the military and the political parties alike, Konoe's government could not stand up to or ignore the wishes of the army. In fact the Konoe cabinet was an extension of the Hirota and Hayashi Cabinet.

The army's effort to establish a totalitarian structure gained momentum as the year 1937 progressed and this was greatly increased after the outbreak of hostilities in China. In the spring of 1938 the General Mobilization Law became operative and it gave blanket war time legislative powers to the Cabinet and suspended parliamentary government. This was a signal triumph for the army and it paved the way for the legal establishment for totalitarian regime. Military preparations were stepped up during the later half of 1938. Military training was made compulsory in all the schools of the country.

Before, the year 1938 ended political parties showed signs of break up. The Senyukai by 1939 had three splinter groups. Tohokai broke up and its existence ended. Conditions for a single party in Japan were becoming bright and by 1940 the country was in a mood to support a totalitarian structure. Prince Konoe became Prime Minister for the second time in 1940 and he strove hard to devote his entire energy to the creation of a truly unified national political structure, with its base in the people and not on the old political parties. The political parties completely vanished from the scene as they were all eager to join the new structure bond wagon.

The militarists were in absolute control of Japan and they aimed at a grandiose scheme of aggression on the mainland. The industrial and commercial magnets had accepted militarist domination. Since the beginning of the depression and the consequent devaluation of the currency, agriculturists had been utterly impoverished and the standard of the life of industrial employees had been greatly lowered but Japanese trade had increased by 50 per cent in volume and about 120 per cent in currency value and Japan had become the third commercial nation in the world. The industrial and commercial magnets had accepted the principle that "trade follows

the flag” and envisaged an absolute monopoly of the Chinese market.

Japan’s campaign of invasion and aggression in China

The aggression in China had developed constantly. In 1933 Jehol was annexed to Manchuko. Early in 1935 Chahar was occupied. In November 1935, Hopei and Shantung were included in an “Autonomous Federation for Joint Defence against Communism.” During 1936 the Japanese army occupied Sulyuan (Inner Mongolia). The whole of northern China was now either annexed, or embraced within a protectorate which was preliminary to annexation. Since the final triumph of the militarists in Japan the leaders of the army had aimed at the destruction of the Nanking government and the complete control of southern China. They “invited” Chiaing Kai Shek to accept Japanese advisers and Japanese military support in restoring order and suppressing communism in central and southern China. (It must be remembered that there were probably fifty million Chinese in the central provinces living under a communist regime).

Japan’s repudiation of International Pacts

Since 1931 Japan had engendered widespread international suspicion and hostility by her flagrant violation of the League Covenant, the Nine-Power Treaty (1928) and the Naval Pact. She had attempted to promulgate a “Monroe Doctrine” of the Far East, which other nations were not prepared to accept. In 1930 she secured a new naval ratio of 7 : 10 : 10 in relation to Britain and the United States of America, but she repudiated this pact and entered into a naval race with those powers.

Economic need and imperialist aspirations provided the incentive and the excuse for the reckless policy of Japan

The reckless policy of the military extremists who then ruled Japan had been stimulated, rather than checked by the recent shrinkage of Japanese trade, which since 1930 had supported their huge military and naval budget at the expense

of other national functions. The perceptible decline had been due partly to the progressive recovery of the western industrial nations, and partly to the economic repercussion of a strong anti-Japanese sentiment abroad, and most particularly and naturally in China.

**Japan Joined Hands with the Fascists Powers in Europe.
“Anti-Comintern Pact” (1936)**

Presuming that Russia had been emasculated by recent internal dissension, and knowing that they had alienated many nations, including all the democracies, the leaders of the Japanese army dictated to their government a policy of a *rapprochement* with the Fascist Powers which would leave them free to complete the absorption of China. At the end of November, 1936, they entered into agreements with Italy and Germany, which are closely reminiscent of the diplomatic methods of Metternich. For example, Clause II of the treaty with Germany states :

The two high contracting parties will jointly invite third parties whose domestic peace is endangered by the disruptive activities of the communist International, to consult with each other concerning measures to combat this activity, and to execute these measures in close cooperation with each other”.

Section B of Supplementary Protocol to this treaty states :

“The competent authorities of both high contracting parties will, within the framework of existing laws, take strict measures against those who, at home or abroad, directly or indirectly, are active in the service of the Communist International or lend assistance to its disruptive work.”

So protected, the Japanese proceeded in 1937 to complete the conquest of China, which to the most extreme of them was to be a mere prelude to vaster aggression. One remembers for example, the Tanaka Memorandum* (1927) : “In order to conquer the world, we must first conquer China.....In order to conquer China, we must first conquer Manchuria and Mongolia. Sooner or later we shall have to fight against Soviet Russia.....One day we shall have to fight against America”.

*The authenticity of this memorial, said to have been presented by the Premier to the Emperor, is denied by the Japanese Government.

In the meantime Chiang Kai Shek and the Kuomintang were carrying on a chaotic campaign against separatist "war lords" and communist leaders in China. In the course of this campaign Chian Kai Shek was kidnapped in December 1936 by the Communist General Chang Hsuehliang the 'Young Marshal', at Sianfu, capital of Shensi Province. Now the Chinese communists and the northern "war lords" were the champions of opposition to Japanese aggression. In the negotiations for his release Chiang Kai Shek agreed to cease his attacks upon these two groups and to form with them a united "Popular Front" against the Japanese. So, in response to Japanese manoeuvres, a Kuomintang-Soviet *rapprochement* was restored. Declarations of friendship were exchanged between the two governments.

An intensified anti-Japanese propaganda and boycott ensued throughout China, hostile "incidents" became more numerous, clashes between Japanese "military police" and Chinese officials and civilians grew more frequent, until finally Japan issued an ultimatum, demanding a complete cessation of Chinese opposition to her efforts to eradicate communism and to restore and maintain order in China. Not receiving a reply which she considered satisfactory, she opened a campaign of invasion and aggression in China in 1937, whose ruthlessness shocked the world. By the end of 1939 she had secured a hold over most of the North China provinces. She had obviously been encouraged by the increasing triumph of the aggressive spirit in Europe at that time.

Economic Basis of Japanese Expansionism

The most urgent problem of Pacific politics since 1894 had been that of Japanese expansion. Let us examine the economic basis of that expansion.

A very high birth-rate intensified the problems of over-

population in the small Japanese Islands*. Emigration to the American or Australian continents was forbidden to her by rigid immigration policies designed to protect the American and Australian standard of living from Japanese competition or undercutting. Japanese colonization in China was unprofitable in that it brought Japan face to face with Chinese antagonism and into competition with the still lower standard of living of Chinese and Korean coolies. Economically Japan was becoming increasingly dependent upon the outside world, upon imports of food and raw materials and industrially upon her exports. Her chief export, silk was a commodity which in itself was dependent upon a high level of world prosperity, and when under the growing economic depression, the United States and other countries began to protect their own industries and close their markets to Japanese manufactures by high tariffs, her plight became desperate and pitiable. Her own industries had not a sufficient backing of capital to support a period of strain, and her 'economic area' was too small to be protected by tariffs.

Difficulties of Japan at the outbreak of the Second World War

Despite Japan's hold over most of the North China provinces, she was in a quandary at the outbreak of the Second World War. She was confronted with a hardening Chinese nationalism which was passing from an anti-British, through an anti-Russian, into an anti-Japanese phase. She could not yet overcome Chinese resistance, which was 'finding new refugees and new centres in the western provinces'. She had antagonized the powers. Nor had she yet secured the desired economic control, even over her conquered areas, and she had seriously embarrassed her own finances at home

*The population of Japan had been steadily increasing since 1894, and stood at 105,226,101 at the time of the Second World War. India though thirteen times larger in size than Japan, then had a population of 388,800,000. In other words, the density of population of Japan then was three to four times larger than that of India.

Nationalism and Militarism in Japan (1928-1941)—**A Summing up.**

The Meiji era had made Japan one of the highly industrialized countries of the world. The Russo-Japanese War (1905) was a pointer to the development of Japan militarily. Japan allied herself with Britain in the first world war and extracted some benefits from the Peace Treaty of 1919. Subsequently she became the permanent member of the League of Nations.

In the year 1932 the Japanese Prime Minister was murdered by a fanatic for advocating peace. This was one of the murders inspired by militarists and extreme nationalists and implemented by secret societies like the Black Dragon.

During the 1930's the militarists set up a Fascist government in Japan. As a result many liberals and radicals were executed. The Press and schools and the radio became the agent of the Fascist propaganda. The Japanese propagandists urged the Asians to follow Japan's lead and drive out the westerners from the Orient. In reality the hidden objective was to enable Japan to politically and economically dominate the Far East.

During the 1930's the increasing tensions in the newly industrialized Japanese state were subsumed in military adventures abroad which culminated in war with China and the United States. Fascism, ultra-nationalism and militarism are terms often used to contrast this period with the 1920's. A number of questions which are central to the problem arise and this is essential to understanding what was happening during these years. Was the 1920's a period of emerging democratic forces which were thwarted in the 1930's? Was the increased diversifications of Japanese society in the 1920's—modern intelligentsia, industrial workers, a salaried white collared class—reflected in progressive reforms? Or did the reforms represent little change in the essentially authoritarian political system established in the Constitution of 1889 and there was no real move towards genuine democratic institutions?

By and large, there is little evidence of the trend towards the extension of political and economic power to the Japanese

people themselves or to a truly democratic Diet in the 1920's. Universal male suffrage was no doubt granted in 1925 but in the same year the government passed the notorious Peace Prevention Law which was used to repress groups regarded as leftist extremists. General prosperity was also marred by the catastrophic Tokyo earthquake of 1923. Added to this was the poverty of the rural population.

The economic depression and Japan's increasing military involvement on the mainland of Asia led the government to increasingly suppress dissenting groups and political parties. The mid thirties saw increasing attacks on labour and peasant tenant unions. The assassination of leading politicians and businessmen in the mid thirties was a threat of the stability of the political system and resulted in the ascendancy of the military. These events made the beginning of what is called Japanese Fascism.

Following the murder of prime minister Inukai in 1932 the military cabinet which came into power embarked on military adventures abroad and the Japanese invasion of China was possibly the outcome of the imperialistic traditions inherent in the foreign policy of the Meiji oligarchs. Japanese industrialisation necessitated the need for new markets and raw materials beyond its borders and this defined the framework of Japanese policy until the end of the Second World War. Japanese interest in Manchuria, Northern China and Korea was obvious even before the 1930's and the Sino-Japanese War of (1894-1895) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-05) were fought to protect Japan's special position in the area. Economic interests provoked the Japanese occupation of Manchuria and the creation of the puppet state of Manchukuo. The Japanese policy resulted in scores of military clashes and resulted in the outbreak of the war between China and Japan in 1937.

What enabled the militarists to wield so much power was the fact that the feudal spirit of the Samurai which glorified the warriors and fanatical nationalism had remained really strong. Further Japan's island position had protected it from any large scale invasion and isolated as it was, the Japanese developed nationalistic tendencies even before modern times

and they felt different from others. Further this spirit of nationalism was strengthened by the concept of Emperor worship. Shintoism preached blind obedience and even gave their lives to the sacred rulers.

There was little real democracy in the constitution of 1868. This made it possible for military leaders to dominate civilians. These militarists had won territory for Japan in the Sino-Japanese war of 1895, the Russo-Japanese war (1905) and World War I. They had earned prestige for themselves. Many of the Japanese capitalists fearing that the militarists might provoke a war, favoured a peaceful policy. Therefore to offset and counter these militarists, the moderates who were in control of the government in the 1920's cooperated with other governments and signed treaties like those of the Washington Naval disarmament conference and the Kellogg Briand Pact. For these the militarists bitterly criticised the moderates.

Then in 1929 the economic depression struck. With its small area, few natural resources and a huge population the country had to continue exporting or face starvation to death. In the wake of the depression other countries raised tariffs and cut down Japanese imports. Japanese industry was hit hard. The appalling economic conditions made the capitalists agree with the militarists that the solution to Japan's economic ills lay in imperialistic conquests. Besides the government officials were warned at the apparent loss of faith on the part of the Japanese in emperor worship and the demand for greater representation in the government. For these reasons a war was needed to divert the masses. Japan accordingly in 1931 began hostilities in China. The Japanese posed themselves as acting to "save Asia from communism". The Japanese army moved in and occupied Manchuria in the face of a lethargic attitude of the League of Nations and the protests of America. The new puppet state of Manchukuo was created. In 1933 Jehol was annexed to Manchukuo and in 1935 the Japanese troops captured Chahar. Gradually other neighbouring provinces were added and by 1936 Japan controlled most of North Eastern China. When the western powers protested Japan withdrew from the League of Nations. In April 1934

Japan formulated the Japanese Monroe Doctrine and became the self appointed guardian of peace in the Pacific. In 1936 Germany and Japan signed the pact of which Italy also became an active member and thus came into existence the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis. All the three countries promised to help one another. Japan now had the support of European allies.

As Russia had been helping China, trouble with the former was inevitable. During 1937 clashes took place on the Russian border. Though Japan suffered reverses, she continued her hostilities in China and destroyed city after city. Shanghai and Nanking were occupied. However, it must be said to the credit of the Chinese that they continued to fight. In 1939 South China was attacked and most of the coastline was occupied. America, England and France protested and Japan as usual lent a deaf ear to their appeals. In June 1939, Japanese forces blockaded British concession in Tientsin.

The outbreak of the Second World War was what Japan needed. The fall of the France in 1940 enabled Japan to gain air bases in French-Indo China. In order to cover up its plans, the Japanese sent a new ambassador to Washington. While he was negotiating peace the Japanese attacked the naval base at Pearl Harbour on December 7th, 1941. The bloody hand of the Japanese was exposed and the United States declared war. On this very day Japanese planes raided Singapore, Shanghai and Malaya. Four days later the Japanese destroyed British Naval ships.

The Japanese soon occupied the Philippine Islands, Singapore, Burma, and the Dutch Indies. By the end of 1943 Japan had achieved a resounding victory but this glory was shortlived and Japan suffered reverses.

The influence of the military declined after the Japanese reverses on the battlefield in the Second World War and as the war progressed it became obvious that defeat loomed large and that Japan would have to surrender. Japan was completely defeated by the middle of 1945. The policy of militarism had accentuated Japan's problems—the industry had collapsed, cities had been bombed and what was worse was the people were on the verge of starvation.

Stage of Colonialism in India

(*MERCANTILISM, FREE TRADE AND
FINANCE CAPITAL*).

Keen competition for colonies was a driving force among the European nations of the sixteenth century Europe. These countries were Portugal, Spain, Holland, France and England.

The earliest to secure valuable trading ports on the West coast of India were the Portuguese. Their important possessions were Goa, Daman and Diu. They were followed by the Dutch, the English and the French.

In the sixteenth century all that the Europeans had were a few strongholds and warehouses, in the seventeenth century followed trading stations and settlements. It was in the eighteenth century that they began a systematic subjugation of Indian States.

What is of significance is that by the middle of the eighteenth century the European nations did not have to deal with a powerful Mughal empire but only individual States, both big and small, who were fighting with each other for supremacy and they enlisted the support of Europeans in their fights against their local opponents.

In this period both the English and the French East India Companies were a force to reckon with in India. Their respective governments had granted them military and governing powers as well as trading rights. The English controlled the cities of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta while the strongest French possessions were Pondicherry and Chandernagar.

It was the French company that made the first attempt to

set up a colonial empire. It was Dupleix, who dreamed of a strong French empire with himself as the Nawab.

The important feature of this period was the struggle between the French and the English for supremacy. In a series of three wars—the Carnatic wars—the English overwhelmed their French opponents and completely made them ineffective. Even though the French retained Chandernagar and Pondicherry they had no importance.

Having defeated the French, the English set about the task of consolidating their possessions and expanding further. They cast their covetous eyes on Bengal which at the beginning of the century was one of the most flourishing provinces. Sirajud-daulah, the Nawab of Bengal irritated by many things that the British had done occupied Calcutta. Robert Clive took revenge for the Nawab's success in capturing Calcutta. Clive bribed the Nawab's minister, Mir Jafar and forged a document. Thus by treason and forgery, Clive prepared the ground for the battle of Plassey. The battle of Plassey (1757) proved significant. It decided the fate of Bengal and laid the foundation of British dominion in India.

A few years later the British won another battle at Buxar and by the treaty of Allahabad signed in 1765, the Mughal emperor became the pensioner of the English government and the mastery of the English over Bengal and Bihar was unchallenged. The British position was now one of power and wealth without any responsibility. English company had become the Diwan from a mere trading company.

The last quarter of the eighteenth century was utilised by the company to consolidate its power and the authority in territories already under its control and extending its influence in the independent States of India.

This process of extending influence was achieved by means of the subsidiary alliances. As per the terms of these alliances the independent rulers accepted the stationing of British troops in their States for quelling internal revolts as well as facing external threats and dangers. In return the States gave up their independence in foreign affairs and were obliged to conduct their foreign relations through the company exclusively, disband or dismiss French troops if any in the States. Above

all the cost of maintaining the subsidiary forces was the duty of the native States. Thus the British were able to maintain armies fully equipped without any cost to themselves. The Britishers had by means of the subsidiary alliances spread the tentacles of British imperialism. It may be mentioned that this scheme was perfected by Lord Wellesley who became Governor General in 1798. It was nothing new but Wellesley expanded its scope and use. In fact Warren Hastings had started the practice of having puppet Indian princes under British control. These princes merely became the cat's paws.

As time passed and the British empire grew and developed the British fought many more wars with the other people and races in India viz. the Marathas, Afghans and Sikhs. The unique feature of these wars was that they were fought for England's benefit and India paid for them. The English only reaped the profits without financially burdening themselves.

The Government of India was controlled by the East India Company—a trading company—but the control of the British Parliament began gradually to increase with various Acts and Bills that were enacted for the ostensible reason of giving a good government to the country. A beginning was made with the Regulating Act (1773) and Pitts India Bill (1784) which sought the affairs of the East India Company which were in a bad shape. In the main however the destiny of India was in the hands of big businessmen and the government existed largely for trade and trade was plunder on a large scale. The rule of the East India Company continued till 1857 when after the Great Revolt, the government was directly taken over by the British Crown.

The growth of industrial development and industrialization of India need to be placed into a historical perspective. The performance of Indian industries was remarkably better than other countries prior to 19th century. Till 18th century, India was a great manufacturing country and not only that but “the tradition of economic growth, entrepreneurship and industrialisation, which modern India inherited was quite impressive by contemporary standards.” The productivity in manufacturing was more than that of a number of East European countries in the West and of the industrial centres

of Japan in the East, even if only manufacturing at Coromandal Coast or Bengal is taken into consideration.

India was the major supplier of textiles to the whole of South East Asia, Iran the Arab countries and East Africa. The textiles included not only fine clothes but also every-day wear for the masses. Other well developed industries can be mentioned as Shawl industry of Kashmir, muslin of Dacca, aniline dyes, wood carving, bidri work etc. The other major items of exports included raw silk, sugar and even salt petre. The only primary agricultural product exported in quantities was indigo which also required some processing. In her foreign trade India was very much an exporter of manufactured products and importer of primary or intermediary goods which included an insignificant amount of luxury goods, like richly carved swords and occasionally, cannons. Except these India imported no manufactured metal products.

In the 17th and 18th centuries India and China were about the only Asian countries with a very rich merchant class trading in its own ships with distant markets. Even in Europe, only a few countries had merchants so well provided with liquid capital and with such a wide area of operation. Another institution, that of Shroffs and Poddars—money changers and bill brokers—were conspicuous through most of the century, not merely in banking but also in law. Yet the patronage of native Indian courts was not in any way less responsible for giving an impetus to the indigenous industry. As far as circumstances permitted the urban industries in India were well organised, and provided that a demand for their products was forthcoming, they were in a flourishing condition. In short, at the beginning of 19th century they occupied a very important position in India's economic activity.

With the disintegration of Mughal Empire and the growth of British political power a new transitional phase of economic activity came into being. Since the triumphs of Clive at Plassey in 1757 the indigenous and the British entrepreneurship played their roles in different ways, either competitive or complementary. The British entrepreneurship took mainly two shapes under East India Company and later during the rule of the Crown. It started with the introduction of Agency

houses and then changed the form into managing agency system. These were the main factors which gave shape to the emerging pattern of investment and the role of entrepreneurship, which in turn was responsible for the development of the Industries.

In so far as economic interests were concerned there was an obvious conflict. The issues were always decided in favour of England, the Mother Country. Adam Smith had pointed out the harmful effects of the East India Company's rule—“The government of an exclusive company of merchants is perhaps the worst of all the governments for any country—it is the interest of the East India Company considered as sovereigns that the European goods which are carried to their Indian dominions should be sold there as cheaply as possible and that the Indian goods which are bought from there should be sold as dear as possible. But the reverse of this is their interest as merchants. As sovereigns their interest is exactly the same with that of the country which they govern. As merchants their interest is directly opposite to that interest”.

Not only this, Daniel Defoe, the author of the well known book Robinson Crusoe complained that Indian cloth had “crept into our houses, our closets, and bed chambers, curtains, chairs and at last beds themselves were nothing but Calicos of Indian stuff”. Therefore restrictions began to be put on Indian goods in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

With the coming of the Industrial Revolution there was a complete change of its economic policies in so far as India was concerned. A primarily agricultural India was soon made an economic colony of England.

The government now followed a free trade policy, that is unrestricted entry of British goods. Indian handicrafts had thus to face a stiff competition from the machine made goods of industrialised Britain. Unfortunately for the Indians ; Indian goods sent to Britain were subjected to heavy duties and eventually their export to Britain was stopped. In 1824 a duty of $67\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was imposed on Indian Calicos and muslins were subjected to a duty of $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. In this connection H.H. Wilson truly asserts “It was stated in evidence that the cotton and silk goods of India upto this

period could be sold for a profit in the British market, at a price 50 to 60 per cent lower than those fabricated in England. It consequently became necessary to protect the latter by duties of 70 to 80 per cent of their value or by prohibition. Had this not been the case, had not such prohibitory duties and decrees existed the mills of Paisley and Manchester would have stopped in their outset and could scarcely have been again set in motion even by the power of steam. They were created by the sacrifice of the Indian manufacturers. Had India been independent, she would have retaliated, would have imposed preventive duties upon British goods and would have thus preserved her own productive industry from annihilation. This act of self defence was not permitted to her. She was at the mercy of the stranger. British goods were forced upon her without paying any duty ; and the foreign manufacturer employed the arm of political injustice to keep down and ultimately strangle a competitor with whom he could not have contended on equal terms”.

The British carried with them immense wealth from India which led John Sulliwan, the president of the Board of Revenue to remark, “Our system acts very like a sponge, drawing up all the good things from the banks of the Ganges and squeezing them down on the banks of the Thames”. This gives us an idea of what was happening. How much money was drained away cannot be estimated.

000 The ruination of Indian handicrafts led to the decline and wiping out of prosperous industrial cities. William Bentinck, the Governor General of India stated in 1835 that “the misery hardly finds a parallel in the history of commerce. The benes of the cotton weavers are bleaching the plains of India”.

Together with the destruction of Indian industry, the Indian cultivator was also impoverished in the nineteenth century. This was because of the excessive land revenue and it added to the woes and misery of the peasants. Bishop Heber wrote “Neither Native nor European agriculturist, can thrive at the present rate of taxation. Half of the gross produce of the soil is demanded by the government.

Unable to meet his needs, bare necessities drove the peasant into the arms of the money lenders and as time passed the

peasant grew deeper and deeper into debt and at times eventually forfeited his land, his only means of livelihood. Before the arrival of the British on the Indian political scene, India was the workshop of cotton manufactured goods which were exported to different parts of the world and this position she had enjoyed from times immemorial. The muslin made in Dacca was too well known for its fine finish and texture. Cotton, raw silk and silk goods were exported. Vere 1st who succeeded Robert Clive as Governor of Bengal wrote, "The former was easy, the artisan encouraged, the merchant enriched and the prince statisfied".

However, this happy state of affairs was not to last long. India's wealth was sent to England by a process of what may be described as organised looting. Bengal which was one of the richest provinces in the country became the poorest through a policy of systematic exploitation; the destruction of its traditional industry and the establishment of a quasi monopolistic control of the East India Company. What was unthinkable was done. The Parliamentary Acts of 1700 and 1720 forbade the use of cotton and silk goods imported from India which, "could not be worne or otherwise used in England". Because of restrictions imposed on Indian goods, the weavers, spinners, dyers, bleachers, and other artisans all suffered untold misery which is unparalleled in the history of commerce. The very basis of Indian economy was completely destroyed and in course of time India was reduced to the position of an agricultural farm of England. From being an exporter of cotton goods, India became an importer of British textile goods. The key note of Britain's policy remained and continued to be the exploitation of India's resources and enriching England.

The destruction of important industries inevitably led the people to fall back upon agriculture—the last resort of survival. The increase in rural credit was coupled with an increase of population. As a result of the high rates of interest, there was an accumulation of interest and the poor agricultural classes steeped deeper and deeper into debt. The indebtedness of India's agricultural population reached unmanageable proportions. The money lender used all possible techniques

to hoodwink the uneducated and illiterate farmers. Money was given upon personal pledges mortgages and securities. The interest charged was at times as high as 35 to 50 per cent. Any measures that the government enforced for the relief of the peasants at periodic intervals only encouraged the money lenders to become more greedy and resort to fraudulent practices. Even small loans for such things as food seeds, bullocks and governmental taxation only increased the burden of debt. Not only this another back-breaking burden of the Indian peasant was ancestral debts. It was a most unfortunate situation where the poor and innocent farmer was exploited to the hilt by the unscrupulous moneylenders and at times the peasant became the bondsman of his creditor. The poor farmers only became poorer. Macaulay's India of "usurers, money-lenders and sharp legal practitioners" was the product of the new system of administration given by the British to India. No doubt there were many evils prevalent even during Mughal rule but those that came into existence were more oppressive than before.

Finance. The finances of the East India Company were mostly dependant on land revenue. To begin with it was Bengal that produced a surplus but new land legislation ensured surpluses in many other areas *viz.* Madras, Bombay, United Provinces, Central Provinces and Punjab. Another major source of revenue was the opium monopoly. These two items accounted for 4/5 th of the total revenue.

The destruction of Indian Industries gave rise to a new economy which began taking shape during the first half of the nineteenth century. European banks often suffered from bankruptcy and a number of Indian businessmen working with the English in mercantile business were also involved in these insolvencies. The Indian capital remained passive rather than being active. The early period of economic ventures inspired and motivated by over enthusiastic and eager individuals gradually gave way to a well organised and regulated English Commercial Capitalism. This was made possible after a realization of the practical pitfalls and errors.

To the Britishers, India was a large market ready to be exploited. This market was easily dominated by British.

commercial capitalism and the natural corollary was industrial capitalism. The flow of British capital to India was always on profitable terms and an obstruction to freedom of trade was quickly removed to facilitate the English manufacturers and shippers. Consequently jute, tea and cotton industries were developed.

The British policy is clearly revealed in its fiscal measures. In 1882 all import duties except on salt and liquor were done away with. In 1899 import duties on cotton were once again levied. What was worse was that excise duty was imposed on Indian goods that came in competition with Lancashire products. The 1896 Cotton Duties Act was an example of fiscal injustice unparalleled in the history of any civilised country. It had levied a duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on all cotton goods produced in every mill in India. The additional levy was imposed in spite of the fact that no mill in India competed with those in Europe. The price of coarse cloth—a poor man's requirement was thus raised. It was a glaring example of British economy at its worst.

Ranade asserted in 1890—The industry and commerce of the country, such as it was, is passing out of our hands and the country is fed, clothed, warmed, washed, lighted, helped, comforted by a thousand arts and industries in the manufacture of which its sons have a decreasing share. It is transferring the monopoly not only of wealth but what is more important of skill, talent and activity to others. Even Dadabhai Naoroji exposed the policy of British exploitation in his famous work "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India". "They (Indians) simply acted as mere slaves to slave upon their own land, and their own resources in order to give away the products to British Capitalists" (Dada Bhai Naoroji). Gokhale pointed out that, "we have no constitutional safeguard against the misapplication of our revenues for extra-Indian requirements—the government of India cannot be much interested in economy" and went on to add "I condemn the manner in which the government are going in for more and more railways moving out more useful things. This has resulted in the exploitation of our resources by the indigo, tea, coffee and other planters". He also felt that transforming India into an

overwhelmingly agricultural country and dependent on imported manufactured goods was part of a long process which was accelerated by the construction of railways.

Such was the state of affairs created by the British policy in India. The Indian handicraft declined and disappeared, her trade wiped out and her peasantry completely ruined by a deliberate calculated policy of enriching the Mother country. India merely became a market for British goods and a supplier of essential raw materials.

The attitude of the Indians to the problem of foreign capital was revealed by what *Bengalee* of June 1st, 1901 wrote that the increase of foreign investment would accelerate the country's ruin and "surely reduce our nation to a state of eternal economic dependence upon British Capital." Bipin Chandra Pal in his *New India* of August 12th, 1901 wrote : The introduction of foreign and mostly British capital, for working out the natural resources of the country, instead of being a help, is in fact the greatest of hinderance to all real improvements in the economic condition of the people. This exploitation of the land by foreign capitalists threaten to involve both Government and people in common ruin.....It is as much political, as it is an economic danger and the future of New India absolutely depends upon an early and radical remedy of this two edged evil.

Even G.V. Joshi writing in 1855 realised the inherent danger. "Politically speaking, if we do not twist history, power must gravitate towards property and wealth, and a strong foreign mercantile interest in the country would not fail to be a very troublesome active factor in the State, it would always be disposed to use the power and influence it could command for its own selfish aims and dominate the action of the government in its own favour".

Not only this the *Hindu* of 23rd September, 1889 had asserted - where foreign capital has been sunk in a country, the administration of that country becomes at once the concern of the bond holders so if the influence of foreign capitalists in the land is allowed to increase, then goodbye to all chances of success of the Indian National Congress, whose voice will be drowned in the tremendous uproar of 'the empire in danger'.

that will surely be raised by the foreign capitalists”.

The nationalists on the whole began to realise that if need be what India required was importation of foreign capital but certainly not the capitalist.

The Indian capitalist class developed from about the middle of the nineteenth century and as Bipan Chandra says this class did not develop an organic link with British capitalism, it was not integrated with foreign capital in India. The leading capitalistic houses in India such as the Birlas, the Tatas, the Modis, the Singhanias, the Dalmias, were certainly independent and in no way subject to foreign capital. The natural consequence was that the Indian capitalists were not in alliance with the British rulers rather they came into confrontation on various economic problems such as effective tariff protection for their industries, and strongly objected to the industrial concerns like Imperial Chemical Industry and Lever Brothers and above all to the investment of foreign capital in heavy industries like shipping, automobile, chemicals and fertilizers. Not only this the Indian capitalists were also opposed to the domination of the Indian Banking by British finance capital and insisted in Indian participation and Indian control. In fact throughout the twentieth century they struggled vehemently to obtain a position of importance in Indian banking and insurance.

Nothing concrete emerged out of their efforts and Shri G.D. Birla in his presidential reply to the third annual general meeting of the Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce on 16th February, 1930 asserted “I am very sorry that we have not been able to influence the government or to convert them to our views, but we never anticipated that. It is impossible in the present circumstances and in the present political condition of our country to convert the government to our views, but I think the only solution of our present difficulties lies in every Indian businessman strengthening hands of those who are fighting for freedom of our country.....Swaraj (freedom) is not a question of sentiment. It is a question of bread. The prosperity of the country depends entirely on the amount of political freedom which we get and I think that not only in the interests of the country but in the interests of the

capitalists, the employers and the industrialists we should try to fight and strengthen the hands of those who are fighting for swaraj.’’

Even though the Indian capitalists were opposed to British economic policies yet at times they preferred to remain silent because first there is no denying they did get opportunities to grow and no matter how hurt they felt, yet their enterprise was never throttled and they made huge profits and achieved a rapid growth during the two world wars.

Secondly the Indian capitalists remained weak for a long period and did not possess the inherent strength to offer any contest to the powerful British imperialists. Not only this slow rate and the small amount of capital accumulation did not pose any real threat to British imperialism and as such Indian capital was never faced with the problem of a halt to their growth or even the possibility of being wiped out.

One must not forget that the Indian capitalist class had to be naturally dependent on the powers that be for the maintenance of law and order. As a consequence the capitalists in India adopted a moderate approach and continued to work in the economic field in collaboration with the British government. This did not in any way imply the subservience of the Indian capitalist class to the British Indian administration. G.D. Birla wrote in 1935 : “The right wing Congressmen are thus fighting against two forces.....the government and the socialists. The latter are making a direct attack by discrediting the leaders for having ‘achieved nothing.’ The government is helping the socialists by ignoring the right wing, between the two the right wing is being crushed. Sensible Indian men and women realise their need of British help”.

It must, however, be remembered that there could never be a permanent reconciliation between the divergent British Imperial and Indian capitalist interest.

The Indian capitalists continued throughout to support the Indian nationalists against the British and at the same time were able to wrest certain concessions from the British.

Dutch Colonialism in Indonesia in the Nineteenth Century

Initially the arrival of the Europeans did not alter the Indonesian scene. Later this was to change. The early Portuguese, Spaniards, Dutchmen and others had to fit into the long established pattern of commerce. In the struggle that followed among the European powers, the Dutch emerged victorious and succeeded in excluding all European rivals from the trade of the Indonesian islands.

In practice the Company adapted its activities at first very largely to the existing trade patterns as other traders had done. The Company was anxious at first to avoid the responsibilities and costs of territorial governance, except to the extent warranted by the need to secure its factories in Jawa, Molucas and Celebes. In time, however, the Company was drawn inexorably into assuming territory, and with it, responsibility. This followed naturally from entanglement in clashes between local principalities and in succession disputes. Nevertheless it is really misleading to speak of Indonesia as a Dutch colony until the last quarter of the 19th century.

To begin with the Dutch concentrated on the spices, the cloves and the nutmegs and the pepper which for long had lured the merchants of the world. But exclusive access alone was not enough for the rapacious Dutch company and its venal servants, the people were mercilessly massacred, enslaved and beggared in pursuit of maximum profit. Nor were the people spared of Dutch exactions. During the course of the 18th century the Company's fortune declined, corrupt officials milked and mulc-

ted it and the company's apparent bankruptcy was apparent by 1780 and its charter expired, unmourned and unsung on 31st December, 1799. There followed a period of some confusion, for although the Netherlands Government took over responsibility for the archipelago, there was no coherent policy or plan for its administration and exploitation. There were revolts against Dutch rule and Raffles in his renowned *History of Jawa* says "ever since the arrival of the Europeans, they have neglected no opportunity of attempting to regain their independence, but as it turned out the Javanese had to wait for nearly 120 years for political independence."

During the early 19th century one name stands out—Herman Willem Daendels (Governor General 1808-11). He was an administrator of drive and zeal and as an admirer wrote "proceeded at once to correct abuses in the old oriental fashion, hangings peculators, European as well as Native, over their own doors without a trial". He believed that private enterprise could extract greater economic benefit for the Netherlands from its colony than could a monopoly, such as the company or some form of state enterprise. Indonesia fell under British control in 1811 and after 5 years was restored to the Dutch in 1816. It was after the takeover from the English that the Dutch finally decided to adopt a highly organized form of trade known as the Culture System. The Culture System or system of forced cultivation whereby the peasants were forced to grow commercial crops on part of their land or to devote part of their labour to the cultivation of government crops grown on wastelands. The two great staple products of this system were sugar an example of a crop grown on peasant land and coffee an example of a crop grown on wastelands. Between them they accounted for 70% of the Indonesian exports at this time and earned about 97% of the estimated profit of the Culture System.

In theory, the peasant who opted to cultivate commercial crops for the government should have been excused payment of land tax and should have been paid for his effort, but in practice it was not so. All safeguards written into agreements were ignored under pressure of Dutch financial needs and the

greed of her local agents. Demands on the peasantry for forced labour in the fields, in the processing factories and in the transport and delivery of the produce passed all reasonable levels. So little time was left to the Javanese for the cultivation of foodcrop that serious famines occurred in the 1840's and the fertile island had been transformed into a vast Dutch plantation, or from the point of view of the people, a forced labour camp.

For Indonesian society and economy the Culture System marked a serious intensification of colonial intrusion and exploitation. Under the Culture System the PRIJAJI (traditional ruling groups) had to ensure that the peasant grew what they were required to and that their labour was available whenever needed. This led to the decline of the Prijaji in the eyes of the people and detracted them from their traditional social base of support.

The sweat and toil of the Javanese peasant made possible economic development in Holland. "The real tragedy of colonial history of Java after 1830 is not that the peasantry suffered. The tragedy is that it suffered for nothing". The deepening economic penetration hastened the destruction of Java's indigenous commercial and industrial sectors and the arts and crafts declined and this process was accelerated by the Culture System. The inevitable consequence was rural unemployment and under employment.

Cultivation of coffee lingered on till the first world war but the Culture System really died in 1870 and a new era was inaugurated ; the era of the great private corporation. The two key measures were both passed in 1870. These were the Agrarian Law and the Sugar Law. The first provided for heritable leases of upto 75 years duration and for hiring of land from Indonesians. The law, however, explicitly prohibited the alienation of the "Native Land" to non-Indonesians. However, the Agrarian law only ostensibly safeguarded Indonesian interests. Though such safeguards were quite inadequate and ruthless exploitation of the peoples went on.

The Sugar law provided for the gradual relinquishment of government cultivation of sugar in 12 annual instalments beginning from 1878. By the end of the century, all the sugar

and 2/3rd of the coffee in Indonesia were being grown on private account.

It was clearly necessary to establish Rusten order (peace and quiet) in the outer island just as it had been established in Jawa before an appropriate climate for investment could be secured. The process after 1870 was accelerated. The major obstacle to the expansion of Dutch authority was Sumatran State of Atjeh against which operations were first launched in 1873. It took over 30 years, an expenditure of 400 million guilders and the loss of countless lives, before it could be claimed that it had been pacified. Dutch writ now ran over virtually the whole area known today as Indonesia.

Some of the outer islands particularly Sumatra had retained direct trade links with the world and had not suffered the withering of economic initiative characteristic of Java.

One must note the changes in Dutch policy towards welfare and social capital provision during the years 1870-1914. In 1878 the BATIG SLOT (Indies contribution to the Dutch treasury) which VAN den BOSCH had inaugurated in 1831 came to an end. In 98 years it had contributed a total of some 832.4 million Guilders to Holland exchequer. Instead expenditure in Indonesia itself began to exceed revenues raised there. Upto 1900, 250 million guilders were spent on building railways, extending the irrigation system, constructing harbours and on other such purposes. This represented the essential social capital counterpart and supplement to the huge influx of private capital into plantations, mines, banks, insurance companies and other appurtenances of economic development which characterised the pre-first World War decades.

But even the social services, education and health primarily resulting from the ethical policy were in the words of a Dutch scholar—"strongly subject to the influence of the powerful estate companies and other large scale enterprises. Irrigation measures benefited the sugar concerns as much as the agricultural population. The health service was in part closely related to the need of the various enterprises for physically fit labour. The fight against contagious diseases, such as plague and cholera, was a direct gain for western business. In so far as it exceeded the elementary instruction of the DESA schools

(village, vernacular) education mainly provided training for administrative personnel in the service of the government and business. The road system and the experimental stations existed chiefly for the benefit of the plantations.

The welfare of the Javanese people was diminishing, was confirmed by the Dutch queen herself who announced in 1901 her government's intention to "enquire into the diminishing welfare of the people of Java". This was the deplorable outcome of a century of Dutch economic activity.

In spite of the Queen's pronouncement about the welfare of the people of Java not much was done. They were at best holy hearted attempts to improve the lot of the peasants. The process was painfully slow and even as late as the 1916 there was still forced labour in these islands under Dutch domination.

When any attempt was made to revolt against the Dutch rule it was crushed with great cruelty. But cruelty can never and has never destroyed the spirit of freedom is proved by history.

The Dutch rule in Indonesia was one of simple repression and suppression with no avenue for self expression. The Dutch ruled these islands in much the same fashion as the English ruled India, exploiting the material and natural resources to enrich the mother country at the expense of the helpless and hapless local people of these islands.

13

Egypt—Its History and Colonization of its Economy (from 1876-1920)

Egypt during the first half of the nineteenth century was dominated by Mohammad Ali who became Governor of the country and was known as “Khedive” after the fashion of Turkish governors.

Mohammad Ali may be described as the founder of modern Egypt. His first act was to destroy the powers of the Mamelukes—a hereditary class which constituted the aristocracy and the ruling class in Egypt. He succeeded in defeating the English and made himself absolute master of the country and acknowledged the Turkish Sultan’s authority only in name. He created a new army, built canals and encouraged cotton growing, which became Egypt’s principal industry. He expanded the territory by adding Syria to Egyptian territory.

Mohammad Ali died in 1849 at the age of eighty. His successors were feeble and incompetent and extravagant people. Ismail Pasha was a selfish despot. He wanted to modernise Egypt in a hurry. He borrowed a hundred million from Europe in order to carry on his projects ; out of these only 16 million were spent on useful public works while the remainder was extravagantly squandered. His European agents were a class whose object was to enrich themselves at the expense of the country and in this they succeeded.

It is an extraordinary story of how financiers and governments worked hand in glove to despoil and dominate Egypt. The Suez Canal built with forced labour was opened to traffic

in 1869. Disraeli the English Prime Minister bought all the shares from the French financiers.

Indeed Egypt in the sixties and seventies was the happy hunting ground of financiers and promoters of the shadiest description. The ruler who could with impunity perpetrate acts of gross perfidy and injustice towards his native subjects was himself mercilessly treated and plundered by the foreign vampires that found such a congenial home upon Egyptian soil. The result was of course financial ruin.

Having spent £ 4 million on the Suez Canal, the British government naturally took greater interest in Egypt than ever before. When the Khedive Ismail asked them to look into his financial affairs, Stephen Cave, the Paymaster General was sent out with some treasury officials. They produced a report, which when published in 1876 showed quite clearly that Ismail was deeply in debt. He had borrowed about £ 100 million, a fantastic sum of money for those times. As a result, European bankers refused to lend him any more money, afraid that they would not get money back. They were right, Ismail was unable to pay out any more sums of interest and therefore went bankrupt. The enquiry had revealed a frightful state of affairs, lawlessness, corruption, absence of all probity and justice and a hopeless financial muddle.

The bankers and financiers felt cheated. They had been promised interest on their loans, and to prove it they had documents called bonds, issued by the Egyptian government. To make sure they would get their money these bond holders, as they were called, formed a body called the CAISSE de la Dette Publique or the Commission of the Public Debt and two Controllers, an Englishman and a Frenchman were appointed by it.

During the next few years these men gradually took over control of the Egyptian government. Taxes were raised and attempts were made to get the Khedives accounts in order. The Khedive had to cut his expenses. He had to accept a civil List and reduce the salaries of civil servants and army officers. He had to rule the country with Ministers, two of whom were the English and French Controllers. They made him call a kind of parliament made up of leading men in Egypt.

Ismail became increasingly annoyed at these changes. His

power was being whittled away. In 1879 he could stand it no longer and resisted but the bondholders were too strong for him. They persuaded the Sultan to depose him and appoint Ismail's son, Twefik, in his place. Ismail had to leave Egypt and his remarkable reign came to an end.

Tewfik was a man after the heart of the European bondholders. He did what they told him. Behind the bondholders were the British and French governments, who held what was called a Dual control of Egypt. In the words of an English official Egypt, "was tied hand and foot, unable to move, almost unable to breathe, without the consent of Europe. "People in Egypt grew to hate foreigners running their country. More than half the country's revenue spent towards payment of the Khedives debts. Poor farmers complained that they had to pay heavy taxes, civil servants and army officers grumbled at having to put up with cuts in their pay. Rich and poor, ignorant and educated, high born and low everybody objected to their country being run for the benefit of the foreigners. In 1836 there were only about 5000 foreigners in Egypt and by this time there were over 100,000. The people of Egypt felt they were being exploited. Unable to turn to the Khedive for help they looked for a leader and found one in Colonel Arabi Pasha. Resentful at foreigners dominating his country Arabi founded the Egyptian National Party in 1879. In their manifesto the Nationalists declared.

"Must Egypt be nothing but a geographical expression? Must her five million inhabitants be as cattle over which are imposed drovers at will? Egypt wishes to liberate herself from her debts on condition that the powers leave her free to apply urgent reforms."

In 1880 Arabi became famous when he dared to tell the Khedive of the grievances army officers had against the government and forced him to change his advisers.

People in Egypt were meanwhile losing all respect for the Khedive and his advisers. Law and order was breaking down. Trouble was brewing and an uneasy calm prevailed. At the beginning of 1892 the British and French governments who were exercising Dual Control over Egypt, together announced that they intended to help the Khedive to keep things in Egypt as they were. The effect of this announcement

was disastrous. People were furious at this interference in their country's affairs. The Nationalists demanded control of the country's finances. Arabi was made Minister of War, incharge of the Army. The Khedive was powerless to resist. Europeans were afraid of what might happen next. Business was badly affected. Everywhere speakers stirred up the people with fiery speeches and riots broke out in June 1882. The British decided to take action against the Egyptians. The Egyptians in the meantime started repairing the ports overlooking Alexandria harbour. The English Admiral Seymour was told to order work on the harbour ports to stop. Admiral Seymour went beyond his instructions. He ordered the Egyptians to surrender their ports. By the time they had agreed to knock them down it was too late. And so at seven O'clock on the morning of 11th July British guns roared out over the harbour of Alexandria and that night the Admiral reported back to London.

"I attacked the batteries and succeeded in silencing the forts at 5.30 p.m. I regret to say that the city of Alexandria has suffered greatly by fire and pillage. The Egyptians fought with determined bravery, replying to the hot fire poured into their ports from our heavy guns until they must have been quite decimated."

During the summer of 1882, the British Army prepared to land in Egypt. Thirtyfive thousand troops from Cyprus, Malta and Gibraltar and India took part in the operations against the Egyptians under the charge of Lt. General Sir Garnet Wolseley. In a few days, Suez Canal was in British hands and Arabi was defeated in the battle of Tel-el-Kebir. Cairo was taken the next day. This time Arabi had fled. The rest of the Egyptian army was easily rounded up. Arabi's power was broken. Arabi was captured and tried and exiled to Ceylon. Eventually he was allowed back to Egypt but not for another 20 years.

Arabi died in 1911. A lady of the Khedives Court said this about him : "He was a good enough soldier and had too good a heart. These were his faults. Arabi was the first Egyptian Minister who made Europeans obey him. In his time, at least, the Muslims held up their heads."

Thus, almost in a fit of absence of mind, Britain found herself the dominant power in Egypt. Egypt had now become a matter of the greatest importance. The Dual control, which operated with France was at an end. Gladstone, the English Prime Minister wanted to withdraw the British army but in fact the army stayed in Egypt for three quarters of a century. Whether they liked it or not the British were becoming masters in Egypt.

As was to be expected, France bitterly resented her being left out of Egypt. Britain not only occupied Egypt but seemed likely to make her occupation permanent, despite frequent promises to withdraw as soon as order was restored. Acrimonious bickerings, took place between the two governments. It is true that the Suez Canal was finally neutralized by international treaty in 1888, but the French could not forget that they had lost the prize, and their failure naturally rankied in their minds.

Bismarck's attitude

Bismarck was very complacent towards British policy in Egypt. He was in fact only too glad to see Britain and France drifting into a position in regard to that country similar to the Schleswig-Holstein problem in 1864. Moreover, if France occupied Tunis and Britain Egypt, as Austria had occupied Bosnia, the Western Powers would be committed to vested territorial interests similar to those of Germany in Alsace-Lorraine, which would allow full scope for Bismarck's diplomatic methods. In any case, Bismarck's policy was regulated by a few simple considerations : the isolation of France, diplomatic friendship for Britain, and indifference to projects of colonial expansion. "The friendship of the British Empire is much more important to us than the fate of Egypt", declared Bismarck.

Britain in Egypt

Meanwhile, in 1883 the British government despatched the very able Marquis of Dufferin to examine and report on the Egyptian situation. His wise recommendations for the

establishment of an autonomous system under British surveillance were incorporated in an Organic Decree. The Dual control was formally abolished, and Baring (Lord Cromer) was appointed as Consul-General, to establish a regime which, under his remarkable direction for almost quarter of a century, not only restored the political stability of Egypt but introduced an era of universal prosperity such as Egypt had never known before. However Egypt's debt remained what it had been at the beginning.

But the French were unappeased. They hampered the financial measures by which Baring was steadily liquidating Egypt's foreign debts. They pressed for a definition of the term of occupation, and for international control, and the British Liberal government promised in 1883 to evacuate the country in 1888, if it should be possible "without risk to peace and order". But Northbrook's* Report in 1884 advised that no term to the occupation be fixed, and expressed the opinion that the achievement of the very beneficial reforms of administration and finance should be gradual and cumulative.

Opposition of France

Various Anglo-French conventions ended in impasse. France even strove to enlist Germany by professing willingness to abandon her dreams of 'revanche' but in the days of Boulanger and the French army increases Bismark replied with cynical coldness : "The goodwill of France could never make up for the ill-will of England". In 1887, the French Premier declared : "If a great Power installed itself definitely in Egypt it would be a very grave blow at the influence of France in the Mediterranean, and in my opinion France should never accustom herself to the idea". But in 1888, Baring at last balanced the Egyptian budget ; the economic development of the country was being directed with so much skill and foresight, that the British evacuation became an academic question.

The plain fact of the matter was that the French quickly realised that the defeat of Freycinet's ministry in July 1882, and the consequent refusal to cooperate with Britain had lost

*Viceroy of India (1872-1876).

for France any hope of maintaining the Dual Control, which she could not stomach. The succeeding ministry with Ferry as foreign Secretary announced that France had resumed 'liberty of action in regard to Egypt but then it was too late. Smarting under a sense of frustration France continued to be bitterly hostile to Britain. This hostility continued unabated until the momentous settlement of 1904.

British Protectorate over Egypt

No British statesman, liberal or conservative, at that time contemplated a permanent occupation of Egypt which was still a Turkish province, but, on the other hand, Britain was determined to secure an absolute guarantee of the security of the Suez Canal, which implied the non-interference of any other Power in Egypt, and the restoration of administrative and financial order in the country. In the pursuit of these clear and defensible aims she was led by the hard logic of facts gradually to establish a veiled protectorate which, after the outbreak of world war, in December 1914, she converted by proclamation into a 'de jure' protectorate. This protectorate was destined, however, to end in 1922 when Egypt was recognised as an independent and sovereign state.

British Protectorate over the Sudan

By intervening in Egypt in 1882 England became immediately involved in a further enterprise, which ended in disaster and humiliation. Egypt possessed a dependency to the south, the Sudan a vast region comprising chiefly the basin of the Upper Nile, a poorly organised territory with a varied semi-civilised nomadic population, and capital at Khartoum. The province, long oppressed by Egypt, was in full process of revolt. It found a chief in a man called the Mahdi, who succeeded in arousing the fierce religious fanaticism of the Sudanese by claiming to be a kind of prophet or Messiah. In 1881, the Mahdi organised a revolt against the Egyptian authority, and in 1883 annihilated a Falstaffian army led by a British soldier of fortune, Hicks. Gladstone's Government announced that Britain would assume no responsibility for this

distant province. It was determined to abandon the Sudan, withdrawing the European garrisons. For this purpose the Government chose the heroic, but headstrong and adventurous, General Gordon. The decision was wise, but the selection of a leader could not have been more ill-advised. "Gladstone's Government", writes Lord Cromer, "made two great mistakes in dealing with the Sudan. The sin of omission was that it did not stop the Hicks' expedition. The sin of commission was the despatch of Gordon to Khartoum", Gordon "threw his instructions to the winds", attempted the impossible, left the request for relief too late, and perished in Khartoum on January 26th 1885 with all his force. It was a severe blow to British national pride, but the serious commitment of the country elsewhere left the awful blunder and disgrace unretrieved for thirteen years, when Kitchener re-occupied Khartoum in September 1898, after the battle at Omdurman (a town of East Anglo-Egyptian Sudan on the White Nile opposite Khartoum), to discover the French flag planted at Fashoda by Major Marchand.

Even though the followers of Mahdi were barbarians yet they possessed one redeeming virtue. Stevenson described what he saw at the battle of Omdurman in the following words :

The honour of the fight must still go with the men who the died. Our men were perfect, but the dervishes were superb, beyond perfection. It was their largest, best and bravest army that ever fought against us for Mahdism, and it died worthily of the huge empire that Mahdism won and kept so long. Their riflemen mangled by every kind of death and torment that man can devise, clung round the black flag and the green, emptying the poor, rotten home made cartridges dauntlessly. Their spearmen charged death every minute hopelessly. A dusty line got up and stormed forward, it bent, broke up, fell apart and disappeared. Before the smoke had cleared another line was bending and storming forward in the same trade.

Sir Reginald Wintgate thus paid tribute to WAD-EL-Hajumi—the trusted lieutenant of Mahdi NAJUMI'S career closed only at TOZKI when his devoted bodyguards sold their lives dearly in defence of his reversed corpse. He was a

devoted friend, stern hard, ascetic and was an incarnation of blind sincerety of conviction. He never transgressed the self appointed strictness with which he valued his conduct. There was no man but trusted his word and his was the distant enterprise, his the forefront of danger always. Mahdiism was the natural outlet for his wild temper. He it was who prepared the strategm which annihilated Hicks. He it was who crept silently through the shallow mud beyond the crippled rampart of Khartoum.

The deadlook at Fashoda brought Britain and France to the brink of war. When the news reached London and Paris, public opinion reacted wildly and irresponsibly. Britain was still smarting under the failure of the Jameson raid in South Africa and the irritation of unpopularity in Europe, French opinion was being inflamed by the Dreyfus case. Fortunately the two men at Fashoda behaved with soldierly dignity and gallantry.

"I must hoist the Egyptian flag here," said Kitchner.

"Why I myself will help you to hoist it—over the village," replied Merchand.

"Over, the fort."

"No, that I shall resist."

"Do you know Major that this affair may set France and England at war."

"I bowed", records Merchand, "without replying",

An open rupture between Britain and France seemed imminent but wiser counsels prevailed, for France "withdrew her horns" at the last moment. A fierce Anglo-French crisis, which had brought the two countries to the brink of war was thus averted by the skin of the teeth, and Britain found herself with a British protectorate over the Sudan, of which the authority was more definite than in Egypt. The power of Britain in the Sudan rested technically upon a different basis than did her power in Egypt.

The eighties and nineties of the last century were full of friction between Britain and France. There was trouble between the two countries not only over Egypt and the Sudan but also over Madagascar, which France had annexed in 1896, thus depriving Britain of the privilege of the 'open door.' There was even more serious trouble over the Niger country, ended

by a settlement (1898) which gave France the control of the mouth of the river, there was a quarrel over Siam (1893) which nearly led to war.

On April 8, 1904, however, the two countries signed an agreement which not only removed the sources of friction between them once for all, but which established what came to be known as the Entente Cordiale, destined to be of great significance in the future. By this agreement France recognised England's special interests in Egypt and abandoned her long-standing demand that England should set a date for the cession of her "occupation" of that country. On the other hand England recognised the special interests of France in Morocco and promised not to impede their development.

So the British ruled and exploited Egypt and her agents and representatives lived with all the pomp and pageantry of autocratic monarchs in their residences. Naturally nationalism grew and reform movements took shape. With the growth of foreign trade a new middle class arose in Egypt and this became the backbone of the new nationalism. Out of this class emerged, Saad Zaghlul Pasha the greatest of modern Egyptian leaders. He had served under Arabi Pasha and worked for Egyptian independence till his death in 1927.

Such was the state of affairs when the first world war began Egypt was placed under martial law right through the war. The territory had been declared a British Protectorate and was swarming with British troops.

With the coming of peace in 1918 the nationalists in Egypt became active and the British tried the approved and well experienced policy of associating themselves with some social group or political section and obstructed the setting up of a single nationality by playing one class or section against the other. Zaghlul Pasha wanted to lead a big delegation to London and Paris to plead for Egyptian independence but permission was refused and he was arrested in March 1919. This led to a bloody revolt. Though the insurrection was suppressed it was far from crushed. Zaghlul Pasha who was released after his arrest in 1919 was re-arrested in December 1921 and deported. This did not improve the situation from the point of view of the English and they eventually decided to

initiate action to conciliate the Egyptians.

England had been provided opportunity by Egypt's extremity. Taking advantage of Egypt's financial embarrassment England introduced control and profiting and planted the British army under the plea of re-establishing internal order and guaranteeing her from external aggression. In fact the Khedive merely reigned but could not rule and the Egyptian ministers became mere ciphers carrying out the behests of their British advisers.

The British in Egypt claimed to have been philanthropic but this tall talk received an appropriate retort of 'An Egyptian' in his letters to an English Politician. In fact this retort is simply crushing "You British charge us with ingratitude but we fail to see the justice of the accusation. For what ought we to be grateful? Egypt's extremity was England's opportunity. Taking advantage of our financial embarrassment to introduce the control and profiting, and subsequently by the ARABI revolt you, uninvited and by force of arms possessed yourself of our country under the plea of restoring the authority of the Khedive, re-establishing internal order and guaranteeing us from external aggression. This was a mere pretext for planting your army in Egypt at a cost to the Egyptian treasury of approximately £ 100,000 a year.

"The true reason for the British occupation was that Egypt is on the high road to India and British policy demanded that the passage of the Suez Canal should be secured for Britain at all hazards. In reasserting the Khedive's authority you took care that though he might be allowed to reign, he should never rule. Our ministers are mere ciphers bound to obey the behests of their British 'advisers' and for whom because they wear the khedival livery—but without a shred of authority—we are forced to provide exorbitant salaries.

"As for Egypt's prosperity since the advent of British rule, have you not obtained your fair share. Have not new markets been opened to you. Has our country not provided you scope for vast engineering, agricultural and other industrial enterprises? Have you not secured banking, mining, railway and land concessions, on your own terms thus obtaining highly profitable opportunities for the investment of your

capital ? Then why should we be expected to praise Heaven, fasting, for your coming among us ? Is it not rather you, English who should be grateful to PROVIDENCE for delivering the land flowing with milk and honey into your hands ?”

The Opium war and the Development of the treaty port system in China (1840-1860)

Period of Chinese Seclusion and Foreign Exclusion

The "Celestial" or "Middle" Kingdom, that is, the centre of the world, is a country larger than Europe or the United States of America, with a high and ancient civilization and a population of teeming millions, conventionally estimated at 450 millions at the end of our period of study, that is in 1941, though expert modern opinion asserts that it was in fact less than the population of India then.

For many centuries, until 1911, China was governed by an Emperor, "the son of Heaven", who was nominally absolute and administered the eighteen provinces of his empire by means of viceroys and an elaborate bureaucracy of officials ("mandarins")*, who were selected by means of a literary examination in the Classics, a method which prevailed for a thousand years. The people of the vast, self-sufficient empire had no need of foreign trade and maintained themselves for centuries in contemptuous isolation from the rest of the world. Intelligent, highly skilled in agriculture and craftsmanship, rich in art, literature and philosophy, worshipping tradition, they remained immune for long from "that strange despised as indistinguishable from the brigand—to which he has continued till to-day to bear a striking resemblance.

*There were nine grades each distinguished by a valuable jewel (called a "button") worn at the top of the hat.

The sixteenth century was the century of the Portuguese, the seventeenth belonged to the Dutch, but the eighteenth and nineteenth were the centuries of the British. The industrial revolution added new motives for overseas expansion and colonial conquests. The British extended their power beyond Singapore and riveted their attention on China. With the ousting of the missionaries from China, Europe shifted its interest in China from culture to commerce. Merchants became the only bridges between East and West and China's relations with the outside world became essentially its relations with the East India Company, limited and restricted as they were. The British in particular began dreams of the huge profits which could be made if the trade with China could be placed on a regular and open basis.

The Chinese regarded all leaders as of low order and looked upon foreigners as the lowest. Europeans meant nothing but trouble. British traders found China, as difficult to enter as Heaven and as difficult to get out of as the Chancery. "Trade was carried by means of Chinese hong (shops) or merchants who belonged to the co-hong, a kind of Chinese Chamber of Commerce, with membership sanctioned only by the Emperor. In addition to the Viceroy, the Emperor had in Canton a hoppo or Superintendent of the Customs for the control of trade and the collection of fees. Every foreign vessel was secured or assigned to a security merchant, a member of the co-hong, who was responsible for the sale of inbound cargo, the provisioning of outbound cargo, and for every operation connected with the arrival and departure of the ship. The co-hong was the sole medium of communication between foreign merchants and any Chinese authority.

To negotiate improvements in trading conditions (and to establish direct political relation with Peking) first Lieutenant Coland Cathcart was nominated as special envoy to the court of Peking. He died before he reached Peking.

In 1792-93 the English Government sent an Embassy under Lord Macartney. The Chinese Emperor Ch'ien Lung received him and presents were exchanged. The British request for equal representation and free trade was turned down by the Chinese Emperor. The granting of such requests was in no way compatible with the traditional manner of handling such matters.

and the old restrictions on foreign trade. The British demands were summarily dismissed by the Emperor who sent the following reply to George III, the then King of England.

“You, O King, live beyond the confines of many seas, nevertheless, impelled by your humble desire to partake of the benefits of our civilization, you have despatched a mission respectfully bearing your memorial. Your Envoy...has crossed the seas and paid his respects at my Court on the anniversary of my birthday. To show your devotion you have also sent, offerings of your country’s produce.

“I have perused your memorial : the earnest terms in which it is couched reveal a respectful humility, on your part, which is highly praise-worthy. Swaying the wide world, I have but one aim in view, namely to maintain a perfect governance and to fulfil the duties of the State ; strange and costly objects do not interest me. I...have no use for your country’s manufactures. It behoves you O King to respect my sentiments and to display even greater devotion and loyalty in future, so that by perpetual submission to our Throne, you may secure peace and prosperity for your country hereafter.

“Tremblingly obey and show no negligence !”

The reply must have obviously shocked George III and his Ministers. Nevertheless, the English persisted in their efforts and Lord Amherst sent another mission in 1816 which also did not achieve anything. If Lord Macartney’s mission had been a failure, Lord Amherst’s was a fiasco.

It is apparent and obvious from the above extract that a vast gulf existed between China, and the Western World. Britain knew little about China and the Chinese knew even less about the Western barbarians and showed no desire to learn. The seeds of future conflict were becoming all too obvious. The Chinese considered themselves superior and refused to study an inferior. The Chinese Emperor’s arrogance was irreconcilable with English plans of trade and expansion and conflict was inevitable. The English ambassadors were invariably treated as tribute bearers and they were expected to perform the Kowtow (the nine prostrations) before the Emperor which the English invariably refused to do.

New complications aggravated the issue whether to continue the trade at Canton under the old humiliations or to force a

show-down. The first complication followed the abolition of the East India Company's monopoly of China trade. The British now wanted a commissioned, political and diplomatic representative of the Crown to serve as the protector of His Majesty's subjects. The second stemmed from the issue of extra-territoriality. The British became more insistent in their demands for jurisdiction over their own subjects. The third was the much disputed question of the Chinese Opium Trade, in which Britain had the predominant, though by no means exclusive share.

Opium had long been imported into China but the trade was limited. During the years (1736-95) the Chinese imported only about four hundred chests each year, (each chest was about a Kilogram). During the years (1796-1820) the import of opium had increased to about four thousand chests annually. In 1800 the Emperor had issued an edict, prohibiting all importation but in spite of this the opium trade continued to expand. This was made possible because of corruption among the official class who received bribes from the Westerners. Indeed the situation became worse after 1834, when the British Government put an end to the monopoly of the East India Company in the China Trade and threw this open to all English merchants.

The Tao-Kuang Emperor was determined to suppress the use of Opium and he issued ordinances strictly prohibiting opium smoking. Huang Chueh-tzu felt that this policy was obviously too extreme, for he maintained that the opium smokers only harmed themselves while the merchants who traded in opium harmed many. Were not the merchants' crimes much graver than the addicts he asked ?

Since Canton was the main port of entry and sale of opium so forbidding its use should begin there. Lin Tse-hsu who was Viceroy for Human and Hupei concurred with Huang Chueh-tzu's proposals and advocated that all possible steps be taken to enforce them. The Tao-Kuang Emperor having agreed to ban the sale and use of opium sent Lin Tse-hsu as Commissioner to Canton to suppress the smuggling and sale of opium. Lin though a greatly respected scholar official was unfortunately a tremendously self confident and arrogant person who had no

knowledge of handling the so called "barbarians". Reckless as he was, he asserted that "I am intimately acquainted with the wily ways of the barbarian from my sojourn in Fukien."

On 10 March, 1839, Lin Tse-hsu arrived in Canton, "to scrub and wash away the filth of opium". He made it clear to all foreigners that it was not right to harm others for the sake of ones own profit adding "How dare you bring your country's vile opium into China cheating, and harming our people ?

Lin ordered the foreign merchants to hand over to Chinese officials every ounce of unsold opium and to promise not to import any more into China. If this continued Lin warned, "the opium will be confiscated and those involved will be decapitated."

Unfortunately the foreigners thought that like other Chinese officials, Lin could be bought for a price but they did not foresee that Lin was not the type. Lin boldly asserted that "If the opium trade does not cease, I, the Imperial High Commissioner, will not leave my post. I will persevere in this matter until the end."

By the end of March, the foreigners did not surrender the opium they possessed. Lin then forbade any movement to and from Canton, sent troops to surround the thirteen foreign trading establishments and ordered all Chinese to leave the establishments and then went a step further. He forbade people from either entering or leaving the establishments. These trading Establishment were virtually turned into prisons and even sale of food-stuff was banned.

Captain Charles Elliot, the English Superintendent of Trade had hoped for a negotiated settlement, but Lin stuck to his demands. Having realized that there was no way out of this impasse he decided to yield but in this also he proved a wily person. Instead of ordering the English merchants to hand over the opium to Lin, he asked them to hand it all over to him in his capacity as Superintendent of Trade and gave each merchant a receipt and by this method the entire opium became the property of the British Crown.

Captain Charles Elliot, the English Superintendent of Trade handed over 20,280 chests of opium to the Chinese. This was a great victory for Lin, who, with one toss of the net had, trapped such a big quantity of opium. The Chinese Emperors

was indeed pleased and he commended him, saying, “your great loyalty to the throne and your unbounded love of your country are unequalled and unmatched by any within or without the Empire.”

The foreigners still did not believe that Lin was genuinely determined to put an end to the opium trade and they thought that he must be making profits but they soon discovered that their assessment was incorrect.

At Humen, on the Pearl River Delta, Lin ordered two huge pools to be dug in the sandy banks. To quote Lin himself who later wrote “First I had a series of trenches dug and then I dug ditches to connect them. After this was completed, I had water diverted into the trenches through the ditches. Then I had salt sprinkled on the pools. Finally I had the unprocessed opium thrown into the pools and added lime to boil the opium. The opium was thereby turned into ashes and completely destroyed. The nauseating odour was more than we could bear. When the tide finally receded we opened the trenches and let the residue flow away. We then used brushes to clean the bottom of the pools so that nothing remained. The process took twenty three days. Every bit of opium was completely destroyed. Each day civilian and military officials were there to supervise. Even the foreigners came to watch and to record the events in detail.”

Not to be outdone Captain Elliot had sent a detailed report to London and awaited further orders. Lin was offered the position of Viceroy of Kwangtung and Kwangsi but he humbly turned it down saying that “although all the opium in the factories had been completely destroyed, there is still the possibility that more may be smuggled in”. Lin then insisted that all foreign merchants sign a bond binding themselves in irrevocable terms to abide by the Chinese regulations forbidding opium trade. Captain Elliot refused to sign. Lin had the forts at Humen repaired and had a huge iron chain fixed across the entrance of Humen harbour as a blockade. Every time the Chinese clashed with the British ships in and around Canton, Lin sent reports to the Emperor claiming outright victories and creating an optimistic outlook in the country.

Opium War—Treaty of Nanking

On receipt of Captain Elliot's letter, Britain's aggressive Foreign Minister Lord Palmerstone also well known as the moralist imperialist determined to take punitive measures. He demanded payment of an indemnity for confiscated opium and expenses of the British Expeditionary force, giving up by China of her traditional policy of restricting trade, and granting Western nations equality in diplomatic relations.

The opium question was incidental and there can be practically no doubt that if no opium ship had ever come to Canton, wars still would have taken place. Their real object was to put an end to what the British Government saw as intolerable restrictions on the freedom of trade and the liberty of the individual traders and furthermore to impose upon China, British standards of international intercourse—in short to "Open the Door."

In the name of national honour the British went to war with China in 1840. This war is rightly called the Opium War for it was primarily fought and won for the right of forcing opium on China.

Admiral Elliot arrived off the coast of Canton in the summer of 1842 and after laying a blockade, he proceeded North to Tinghai and the city was taken without a shot being fired. The fall of Tinghai came as a shock to the Emperor who had come to believe in the superiority of the Chinese *viz-a-viz* the foreigners, thanks mainly to the memorials of Lin. The Emperor's confidence in Lin was shaken and on 22nd July he issued an edict criticising Lin—"You have accomplished nothing and have caused a great deal of disturbance. In pondering the situation, I cannot control my rage. I await to see in what manner you choose to reply".

To their astonishment and dismay the Chinese found themselves confronted by guns and cannon of an efficiency they could not hope to equal. In truth the Chinese military preparedness was simply laughable. The guns at Shanhaikuan "were remnants of the early Ming period which had to be overhauled for use." The Yangtze River the so-called natural barrier was occupied by the British. Chinese could do little against the British fleet and after two years vain struggle

when in the summer of 1842, the British decided to attack Nanking, the Emperor realized the futility of further resistance and was thus forced to sign the Treaty of Nanking (1842) by which the Chinese agreed to pay in indemnity, cede Hong Kong, open up five ports—Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Tsingpo and Shanghai—to trade with the right of residence for foreign merchants and agreed to a fixed traffic rate which could not be altered save by mutual consent. Nothing was said of the opium actually seized. Next year in 1843 by the supplementary treaty of the Boque, also with Britain, the Chinese granted not-favoured nation treatment, a limited right to travel in the open country surrounding treaty ports and extra-territoriality.

Other countries joined in and exacted the same privileges. The Treaty of Wanghsia was signed with the United States on July 3, 1844, which spelled out details about the extra-territorial system, gave the Americans most favoured-nation treatment, and specified that the treaty should be revised at the end of twelve years. By additional treaties the Chinese gave all these rights to France, Belgium, Norway, Sweden and Portugal.

The treaty of Nanking, the supplementary treaty of the Boque inserted the opening wedge and partially opened China and enabled other nations to extract similar privileges, which they were not slow to obtain. The various treaties had provided for an opening for the development of direct intercourse between the outside world and China, but they left much to be accomplished for it took other blows, before China was actually opened up.

Reasons for China's Defeat in the Opium War

The fundamental and main reason for the defeat of China in the Opium War was her backwardness. The troops and armaments were anachronism, the government was medieval and the people including the official class, had unfortunately a medieval mentality. It was only a calculated risk the Chinese undertook in attempting to resist the Westerners but were doomed to defeat. In fact defeat in the circumstances seemed inevitable.

Even China's defeat in the Opium War did not presage the total collapse of their old notions of "nationality". Even years after the defeat, the Chinese failed to comprehend the reasons for it and what was unfortunate, that the Chinese failed to initiate any reforms which could have dealt a fatal blow to their ancient concept of "nationality". Even after the war and the humiliating treaty of Nanking, the Chinese government and people continued as though the things were the same, numb and insensitive, opinionated and arrogant.

It was only an insignificant minority that in the wake of this disaster woke up to the realization and necessity of studying the list. In fact this period, after the war can be described as the "twenty precious years when China stood still." This minority realised matters with great foresightedness and perception but afraid of public criticism, they remained silent. Lin Tse hsu was one who accepted the hard reality in a letter to a close friend and admitted that the English rapid fire guns were vastly superior to any of that the Chinese possessed and recognised the superiority of English technical knowledge and lamented painfully, "But alas, what was to be done, what was to be done?"

Unfortunately even such persons like Lin who were conscious of their failings did not however voice their opinions in public because such people were not willing to sacrifice their own reputation and allowed the country to slide gradually to destruction. Besides they had no confidence in themselves or in the people and preferred to let things to take their own course and made no attempts to shake up the system or to bring about reform.

The Opium War turned out to be, in the opinion of historians, the first milestone in modern Chinese history. Indeed the Nanking Treaty (1842) concluded after the war was symbolic of China's points of no return. Thereafter, the tide of foreign penetration could not be reversed. A dent appeared in China's defence system and through it poured the heterodoxy of the West which ultimately tolled the death knell of traditional and ancient China.

Opium smuggling, never legalized, continued unchecked. Other nations—the United States of America, France, Prussia, Holland, Belgium, and Portugal—soon obtained trading rights,

by treaties in the five above mentioned ports and China thus became open to the trade of the world.

Significance of the Taiping Rebellion

The Taiping Revolution was a precursor to the twentieth century revolutionary movements. Because of the destruction caused in Central China by struggles with the Taipings, on account of the transfer of military power to various military figures, and concessions that were made to the Western powers as a result of internal pressure, the Manchu Dynasty lost much power and prestige and when forced with a new revolutionary movement half a century later, it fell apart like, a rotten building.

It was inconceivable that the situation in China should remain as it was created by these treaties or that the West should not seek to press the advantage it had gained, once it had secured a foot-hold on the "Celestial Kingdom".

Further anti-foreign disturbances, including the Taping Rebellion, which for thirteen years from 1851 to 1864 divided China in the interests of a counter-dynastic movement, led Britain and France to further wars with China, which resulted in what are known comprehensively as the Tientsin Treaties of 1861.

The Tientsin Treaties (1861)

By these treaties the desired revision of Sino-European relations and the extension of privileges were obtained. Kowloon was ceded to Britain, and eleven new ports—making sixteen in all—were opened to foreign trade. A large indemnity was paid to France and Britain, and rights conceded to foreign missions to reside in Peking, and to foreign nationals to travel in China under passport. Protection for missionaries was promised, and guarantee given of freedom of contract in commercial transactions. An explicit recognition was given of what was then held in China to be one of the most obnoxious privileges possessed by foreigners, 'the right of extra-territoriality'. By this concession subjects of the foreign countries concerned in the treaties were to be subject not to

the laws of China, but to the laws and jurisdiction of their own states.

By 1861 China may be said to have been fully though grudgingly opened to the Westerner. He had gained freedom to trade, extra-territorial rights, and a practical control over the Chinese tariff system. He had penetrated to the interior, the Yangtse valley. The foreign merchant had even come to take a part in the domestic politics of China, and that "Ever-victorious Army" raised on the initiative of European traders at Shanghai in the interests of foreign trade and officered by Westerners, was collaborating with the Imperial Chinese army in the suppression of the Taiping Rebellion. For it was to Europe's advantage to maintain the Manchu dynasty, which guaranteed its privileges."

By the 1890's, the weakness of China was thoroughly exposed and the rapacity of the powers was equally apparent. The British had taken away Hong Kong and part of Kowloon, and the (1860) Russians, the territory north of the Amur river and the Maritime provinces east of the Ussuri. The French had deprived the Chinese of their claims of (1884-85) suzerainty over Tongking and Annam. The British had also taken away the last Chinese pretensions to Nepal and Sikkim and forwarded their position in Tibet. The Portuguese had finally established the legality of their title to Macao. The Chinese saw their ancient glories disappear, their boundaries shrink and their territories pass into the hands of unworthy aliens.

Between 1895-99 the rivalry of concession hunters was so intense from the beginning that in order to make certain profits Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, (and in a timid manner Japan) entered into a series of agreements promising to confine themselves to their own spheres of interest. These inter-power agreements also prevented China from aligning itself with one power as against another or from paying off one power against another. In the meantime, the powers extended their old time privileges. New ports were opened for trade by the Chinese government and additional inland waters were opened to steam navigation. The international settlement and the French concession at Shanghai were enlarged, and many new concession areas were developed at treaty ports.

including Tientsin, Hankow, Newchwang, Amoy and Tsoochaw.

The door had been opened further by the Second Chinese war. An insult to the British flag and the murder of a French missionary had invited the wrath of both England and France who had declared war. By the Treaty of Tientsin (1860) China was compelled as stated above to throw open six more ports, to permit Europeans to travel to the interior and granted protection to Christian missionaries.

China had all along remained rather sceptical of western civilization. The disputed claims over Korea led to the China-Japanese war (1894-95). The Japanese scored a resounding victory and by the treaty that was signed in 1895 China agreed to keep her hands off from Korea and also permitted Japanese entry to Chinese ports, paid an indemnity and ceded to Japan, Formosa and the Liaotung Peninsula in southern Manchuria, adjoining Korea.

The European powers were however not willing to reconcile themselves to Japan's success. Accordingly Russia, Germany and France promptly advised Japan to return the Liaotung Peninsula and Japan complied rather than risk a war with the European powers. Immediately the European powers proceeded to help themselves. Germany seized the Bay of Kiao-Chao and in 1898 China was compelled to lease the bay to Germany for 99 years. Immediately Russia demanded and obtained port Arthur on lease. France obtained the lease of the bay in Southern China and Britain not to be out-done obtained the lease of the port Wei-hai-Wei. Even Italy applied for a lease but by this time China had grown tired of giving away her territory. Thus, the European powers took ports and prepared to partition China. As an English author rightly said : "first the missionary, then the gun boat, then the land grabbing—this is procession of events in the Chinese mind".

Each European power now began regarding its region as a sphere of influence. In this sphere of influence the nations own capitalists were to have a monopoly "concessions for building railways, opening mines, and conducting other profitable ventures which were too ambitious for the Chinese to undertake. China was an inexhaustible treasure house for the European capitalists. China was very rich in coal, iron

and other minerals and her big population comprised of people who were hard working, led simple and frugal lives and were willing to work for small wages, foreign capitalist could employ Chinese labour to dig mines, build railways or work in factories and thus hoped to obtain huge profits. This was the reason for the interest of the Europeans in having a share of Chinese territory and of investing their capital.

The diplomatic heritage to China of the nineteenth century was one of humility and bitterness mingled with hope and determination. Unequal treaties, unequal in the sense that they were not based on the give-and-take negotiation as between equals, adjusted the trading system for the benefit of the West. They extracted indemnities from China, sliced off parcels of Chinese territory, and forced from China political and economic concessions. Treaty settlements, or series of separate treaties imposed upon China by victorious powers as a consequence of war and incidents covered the span of almost a century. From the Chinese point of view the most vicious part of the treaty settlements was the "most favoured nations" clause. By this clause every treaty power demanded and received from China every right and privilege originally extended to any treaty power. What China granted to one, it automatically granted to all.

China was treaty bound to the system of extra territoriality. It was forced to give paramount consideration to the economic desires of foreign powers when fixing tariff schedule and collecting dispensing its maritime customs or internal revenues. It was obliged without compensation and against its will to surrender privileges with other nations jealously guarded as economic monopolies or rights of sovereignty. Extraneous political concessions were obtained in the guise of commercial protection.

Treaty Port System—Privileges Obtained and its Effects

Under the treaties at the ports open to trade foreigners had been permitted to reside and do business. The ports were spread in the entire of China from Canton in the South to Tientsin in the north. But apart from these ports on the coast

many towns on the Yangtze from Chinkiong to Chunking including Nanking and Hankow for a distance of nearly a thousand miles in the interior were considered treaty ports. At these parts the foreigners on the basis of the clauses permitting them to reside and trade began slowly and quietly to build "settlements" and claim the right to set up municipal establishments and courts. Thus at Hankow many hundred miles up the Yangtze there came into existence British, French, German and Russian, settlements. Since the foreigners enjoyed extra-territoriality they set up courts in these places. In a few years spread all over China were small bits of territory from which Chinese authority and jurisdiction were ousted and which in some cases became the centres of every kind of illegal traffic.

The political revolution that brought about the end of the Manchu dynasty stemmed from the changes brought about by the influence of the west. Western influence on China made itself felt through the influx of western goods and ideas. The most important centres of the western influence were the Treaty ports and the new educational institutions. The treaty ports attracted the most enterprising people from the inland districts to participate in the new economic and intellectual life and the loss of the most active and able men helped to weaken leadership in the inland areas where the situation deteriorated into the warlord struggles.

The establishment of the treaty ports brought a large increase in the commodity exchange between China and the western world. By the end of the nineteenth century the Chinese themselves began to participate in this growing trade and there emerged in the Treaty ports a group which had a distinctly western outlook on the trade and business.

In the first decade of the twentieth century the Treaty Ports began to develop as centres of industrial production. Like the commercial development this industrialisation was just introduced by foreign interests. The westerners especially the British began to establish textile mills in Shanghai. Industrialisation later spread to other treaty ports, but Shanghai remained by far the most important industrial centre.

Indonesia, Indo-China, Egypt and China (The Revolution in China 1919-1949)

Indonesia

For nearly three hundred and fifty years, the Dutch ruled one of the most valuable colonial possessions, the Netherlands East Indies. Tin, oil, rubber, coal, rice, spices, tea and tobacco were a few of the valuable products. The exploitation of Dutch led to the emergence of a nationalist movement.

The economic turmoil and the inter war years witnessed an intensification of nationalist struggle. In the early 1920's there were several waves of strikes, some of them violent. These culminated in revolts in 1926 (West Jawa) and 1927 (Sumatra). All these manifestations of revolutionary despair were easily crushed by the Dutch who tightened up their regulations regarding such rights as those of assembly, freedom of speech and a free press. The result was that nothing could be achieved by political action,—“the Indonesian masses retired from the stages, not to return until Japan's victory over the Dutch proved once and for all that the white ruler was not invincible”. But at another level, preparations for eventual independence arose guided by persons who in time became responsible for the new state after the Second World War, among them the future President Seokarno. They tended to be generally secular in outlook and also described themselves as Socialists and were far more closely nationalists in orientation and interests than the leaders of the P.K.I. (Perserikaten

Komounis di-India or the Communist Party of the Indies) which had virtually disappeared as an organised force after the 1926-27 debacle. Unfortunately intense Dutch repression, involving all the permanent leaders in long spells of exile and imprisonment prevented the formation of any single strong unifying party such as the Indian National Congress of British India. Moreover Dutch security vigilance combined with the apathy of the people after 1926-27 prevented the leaders from forging strong links with the country's peasantry. In 1927 the Indonesian Nationalist Party was founded by a young engineer called Soekarno (PNI). The success of this party, which demanded complete independence (and in the mean-time cooperated with the Dutch) led in a couple of years to the arrest of most of its leaders and its suppression. Soekarno was imprisoned from 1929-32. On his release he found the Indonesian nationalists movement plagued by its usual weakness—fragmentation. No single party could establish itself as the true successor of the PNI. Then in 1932 Soekarno was arrested again and exiled. Next year (1934) two of his permanent colleagues followed him into exile Hatta and Sjahrir. All these and many more were to spend the best part of the next ten years festering in remote parts of archipelago until released by the Japanese invaders. The Japanese victory was sensationally swift and complete. Those Europeans who failed to escape were rounded up, publicly humiliated and interned for the duration of the war “watched them” subsequently wrote a Western eyewitness “running for their lives as the news spread that the Japanese had landed—”. The Dutch master race could never—nor ever did—recover from its disgrace and dishonour. This in itself was one of the most important consequences of the Japanese invasion for the Indonesian nationalists. The mass of the people had seen at last that the Emperor had no clothes.

As the Geoffrey Baraclough rightly points out—“It was the Japanese who propelled Indonesia into independence, or, at least who accelerated what might otherwise have been a long and difficult process.

There were a number of factors for this. Firstly the Dutch colonial administration prevented the growth of a middle class and besides there was no capitalist class strong

enough to boost the revolutionary moment in its earlier period. The only way out of this impasse was the creation of an effective liaison between the intellectual leaders of the national movement and the Indonesian people. However, though there was an increase in the number of landless agricultural workers during Dutch rule yet it did not crystallise into a revolutionary agrarian proletariat such as it existed in China. This was primarily due to the existence of the village community that continued to provide basic social security, even during the Depression of 1930's and this factor acted as a brake on the political restlessness. Further there was a fairly late development of an anti-Dutch nationalist movement. It was only the penetration of the leftists that resulted in the emergence of the early cultural and religious nationalist movement—Sarekat Islam—and led it to demand independence. Unfortunately, however, there was no organisation like the Indian National Congress that could bind the divergent groups together, till the achievement of independence and the differences among the working groups of nationalists proved disastrous and facilitated Dutch intervention.

The inevitable consequence was that after the suppression of the Communist Revolt in 1926 the nationalists were thrown on the defensive and it was only the establishment of Persarikatan (later Partai) National Indonesia by Soekarno that efforts were made to weld the existing nationalist groups into one organisation. Even though the PNI under Soekarno provided a semblance of unity conspicuous by its absence earlier and yet it still lacked the firm support of the peasantry and this made it difficult to withstand Dutch counter measures. Without the wholehearted support of the peasantry the nationalist movement had little chance of success. It is in this respect that the Japanese invasion, which eventually destroyed the Dutch authority, proved a veritable turning point. It must however be conceded that the Dutch by bringing together the people speaking different languages and possessing diverse cultures did help to convert the Japanese patriotic fervour into a National movement. Another contributory factor was the large measure of religious homogeneity that existed in Indonesia. The sense of oneness springing from the adherence of the people to Islam effectively counteracted the parochial tenden-

cies that existed among the people.

But there were many other consequences, so many and of such magnitude that they completely transformed the situation and with it the prospects of Indonesian independence. Soekarno and Hatta worked with the Japanese while Sjahrir went underground. Soekarno and Hatta no doubt had to play the anti-imperialist, anti-white, anti-western tune dictated by the Japanese but the tune was readily adapted to the Indonesian nationalist purposes by the skilful Soekarno. As the war advanced he left no doubt in the minds of his followers and countrymen that his anti-imperialism extended to Japanese imperialists too. Further the Japanese eventually permitted propagation of the national language, use of the Indonesian flag and singing of the Indonesian national anthem. These symbols of nationalism were popularised from one end of the Archipelago to the other by Soekarno and Hatta. Sjahrir and others in the underground meanwhile laid the framework for an organisation capable of resisting the return of the Dutch. The Japanese also helped by creating a large number of quasi military organisations especially among the youth and thus a number of people were taught to shoot. Another important outcome of Japanese occupation was that enabled a large number of people to acquire administrative experience which they would never otherwise have obtained. The Dutch had jealously preserved the highest, decision making posts for their nationals and their failure to train a body of Indonesians for ultimate national responsibility, besides being one of the major blemishes in their colonial record, accurately mirrored their determination to stay on in Indonesia as the masters. The Japanese on the other hand required the services of hundreds of Indonesians who suddenly found themselves thrust into positions of authority.

In March 1945 the Japanese appointed a joint committee, the majority of which were Indonesians to discuss plans for independence. Although general agreement was reached on the basic political principles there still were not wanting signs of deep rooted differences of opinion.

On 7th August, 1945 the Japanese authorised the establishment of an all Indonesian Independence Preparatory Committee with Soekarno as Chairman and Hatta as Vice-

Chairman and entrusted it with the task of arranging to take over the government. When the Japanese surrendered a week later, Soekarno and Hatta proclaimed independence within 3 days on 17th August, 1945. Next day Soekarno became President and Hatta Vice-President.

The Dutch were not prepared to accept the new Republic which they regarded as a Japanese puppet regime. In this they were mistaken because all elements in Indonesian life including the former underground units rallied to its cause :

The British arrived in September 1945 to restore law and order. The Dutch quickly followed and fighting spread throughout the archipelago. The military struggle followed a pattern which was to become all too familiar in the post war world. The colonial power succeeded in seizing and holding the major urban areas but failed to control the countryside and communication systems. Nevertheless the Dutch were by no means militarily defeated when, eventually, they gave in and recognised Indonesian independence. First internal developments helped to recommend the Republic to western opinion. In 1948 an abortive Communist led coup was suppressed by the Republican forces. Western powers were thus concerned at the extension of Communist influence in the Republican held areas.

Secondly Dutch actions alienated world opinion and isolated Holland. The Republic succeeded in keeping contact with the outside world despite the attempted Dutch blockade and stories of Dutch ruthlessness and treachery reached the international Press and media.

Guerrilla warfare continued unabated, in the course of which Western plantations and other enterprises sustained great damage. Great pressure was applied by the Americans and finally at the end of 1949 negotiations for the transfer of sovereignty were entered into and the former Netherland East Indies was passed "unconditionally and irrevocably" on 27th December 1949 to the Republic of the United States of Indonesia (RUSI).

To conclude in the words of R.D. Cornwell—"The circumstances in which independence was achieved were not likely to produce good relations between Indonesia and Holland. Within a year of independence, Indonesia had changed her

constitution to provide for a more powerful executive and for a unitary rather than a federal state, and in 1954 the Netherlands-Indonesian Union was dissolved. Two years later, Indonesia, partly because of her economic difficulties, repudiated her debts to Holland, saying that most of these debts represented the cost of the Dutch War against Indonesia between 1946 and 1949. This was followed by the nationalisation of Dutch estates and companies and most of the Dutch residents were forced to leave by 1960. Throughout this period West New Guinea (i.e. West Irian) was a source of dispute. Indonesia claimed it as a part of the East Indies, while Holland said that its population was racially different. Probably using the dispute as a means of diverting attention from internal grievances, Soekarno ordered Indonesian troops to land in the territory in 1962. Eventually Holland transferred West Irian to United Nations administration and in May 1963 it became part of Indonesia".

However it was not smooth sailing for Dr. Soekarno who had become the President. The threat that the 3000 islands would disintegrate loomed large on the horizon. There were four major rebellions since Indonesia became independent...twice in the Moluccas, Macassar and Ambayna and twice in Sumatra between 1956 and 1960. To counteract the threat, a Decentralisation Law allowing for greater local autonomy was enacted but the problem remained.

The Constitution of 1950 had provided for Democratic Government but as tension increased between Jawa and the other islands and the right wing and Communists during 1956-57, Dr. Soekarno had to accept the fact that Western style democracy was not suitable for Indonesia and what was needed was in his own words "democracy with leadership" or "guided democracy". Hence forward Parliamentary government became a mere facade and ultimately in 1960 the House of Representatives was dismissed altogether, Indonesia had taken the first step towards dictatorship.

Democracy had failed in Indonesia due to the immense difficulties facing the country coupled with lack of experience and the existence of too many political parties. Economic ills were among the main causes. In spite of being rich in raw materials the living standards of the people failed to improve

rather they declined. The main contributory factor was the rapid increase of population resulting in food shortage, and importation of rice. Further foreign exchange reserves dwindled rapidly. To top it all, there was rising inflation which resulted in widespread discontent. As late as 1966 when Dr. Soekarno came under intense criticism for his failure to check inflation, he offered a cabinet post to anyone who could bring down prices within a period of three months—with the proviso that anyone who volunteered would be imprisoned for ten years or short if he failed. As expected no one came forward to accept such an assignment for obvious reasons.

Indo-China

Indo-China comprising of Cambodia, Annam, Tongking and Cochin China became part of the French colonial empire in 1887. Six years later Laos was added to the Indo-Chinese Union. Cochin China was a French colony. The remaining four states were protectorates—this really meant that the local rulers remained in their exalted positions but governed their territories under the instructions of the French Residents. The Capital of the French Government was Hanoi, fairly close to the Chinese frontier. Discontent with French rule became apparent from the very beginning and the opening of the twentieth century witnessed constant threats of revolts and rebellions.

Various factors promoted discontent. In 1905 Japan, an Asiatic country had inflicted a crushing defeat on Russia, in 1912 the Manchu Dynasty was overthrown by the Chinese nationalists. Even though the people of Indo-China continued to object to the imposition of French language and culture, it became an important source of ideas about France's revolutionary history. During the First World War the Indo-Chinese who fought in France came back with first hand information. Not only this, Communism was fast spreading from neighbouring China and a large number of people became conscious of the fact that their wealth was only for the benefit of France.

There is no doubt that the French exploited these territories and obtained rubber, coal and rice from these possessions. The masses in all the subjugated territories suffered

from oppressive French rule which was made worse by heavy taxation and poor wages paid to workers.

The growing tide of nationalism led to an occasional uprising. The revolt of 1916 was put down with extreme severity but guerilla activity in the Tongking region proved troublesome. The most important revolt against French rule took place in 1930. It was spear-headed by Ho-Chi-Minh.

He was twenty one years old (born in 1890) when he went to Europe. After working in a London Hotel, he went to Paris and became well known as a Vietnamese Nationalist lobbying for the independence of Vietnam at the Paris Peace Conference. He wrote the pamphlet French Colonialism on Trial. In 1921 he became the founder member of the French Communist Party and in 1923 went to Russia to learn revolutionary techniques and methods. From Russia he moved to Canton and in 1925 he founded the Revolutionary Youth Movement, an organisation for the training and indoctrination of Vietnamese nationalists. In April 1927 he returned to Moscow and ultimately shifted to Siam. In 1930 Ho-Chi-Minh united the Revolutionary Youth Movement with two other groups to form the Indo-Chinese Communist Party.

In 1929 an attempt was made to assassinate the French Governor General and in February 1930 at the fortress of YEN BAY situated on the Red River north of Hanoi, the Vietnamese soldiers revolted killing their French officers. This was followed by the peasant uprising led by the Communists. This national revolt against French rule was effectively and ruthlessly crushed. This was the so called "white Terror" in which thousands of rebels were killed. Though the uprising had been crushed, the movement could not be destroyed and the struggle went on.

During the next decade, Indo-China was comparatively peaceful because the French administration had become weak owing to her defeat at the hands of Germany. During the Second World War Indo-China was eventually overrun and occupied by the Japanese. There was in fact no opposition to the Japanese occupation of Indo-China. The French officials collaborated with the Japanese and French officials continued to administer the country. This state of affairs continued till March 1945, when the Japanese detained

the French and declared Vietnam independent with the Emperor of Annam Bao Dai, as the new head of the state. Ho Chi Minh during this period of tension and turmoil organized the guerilla activity against the Japanese. These guerilla forces were commanded by Vo Nguyen Giap who had studied guerilla tactics under Mao Tse-tung in China. These forces moved into the mountains of Tongking and were so successful that by the year 1945, they had occupied Hanoi and the areas that were later on to become North Vietnam.

After the defeat of Japan Ho Chi Minh tried to turn Vietnam into a Communist state. In March 1946 the Viet Minh and France made an agreement by which North Vietnam was to be a free state within an Indo-Chinese Federation. But unfortunately during the summer negotiations on the details of the Federation broke down. The New French Constitution drawn up in October 1946 included all overseas colonies in a French Union which dashed all hopes of real independence. Both sides seemed to be prepared for war.

The Viet Minh, the army of the Communist Vietnam was led by a brilliant strategist, Vo Nguyen Giap who correctly assessed the dilemma facing France. "The enemy will pass slowly from the offensive to the defensive. The blitzkrieg will transform itself into a war of long duration. Thus, the enemy will be caught in a dilemma : he has to drag out the war in order to win it and does not possess, on the other hand, the psychological and political means to fight a long drawn-out war."

Giap's assessment of how the Vietnam was would be fought was absolutely on the mark. The French grossly underestimated the strength of will of the communists to fight for Vietnamese independence. Unfortunately Bao Dai was not a credible nationalist figure.

November 1946 witnessed the start of eight years of bitter and costly warfare. The Haiphong Incident of 20th November 1946, provided that spark. A French naval boat, having stopped a Chinese junk loaded with contraband, brought it to the port of Haiphong. Local Vietnamese forces opened fire as both ships anchored. The sound of gun-fire resulted in Viet Minh in the port to cross barricades erected by the French, thereby cutting off French units from each other.

About 23 French soldiers were killed followed by 6 more. The French Commanders in the area, General Valluy, decided to teach Viet Minh a lesson and issued an ultimatum to the Viet Minh to vacate the Chinese quarter of Haiphong in their possession. The French moved in and fighting broke out. The French ship Suffren having seen the fighting opened fire on the city. Over 6000 Vietnamese were killed by gunfire, street fighting or were trampled to death in the panic that had gripped the city. On 19th December a rumour spread that a revolt was brewing in Hanoi. That very day the electric power plant was blown up and Viet Minh soldiers killed or abducted nearly 600 French civilians in the northern capital. Within hours the French garrisons in the country were under attack. The Vietnam war had begun.

The Viet Minh, which began this all out war were greatly provoked by French arrogance and were hopeful of a quick victory. All major cities in the country came under Communist fire. As guerrilla warfare was intensified, the French maintained their control over the cities and the chief railways and ports while the Viet Minh began to tighten their net in the northern country side. In 1949, in order to placate the populace, the French declared Vietnam (with Bao Dai again Head of State), Laos, and Cambodia independent within the French Union. France retained control of foreign affairs and defence. But the move came too late. During 1950 Indo-China became involved in the cold war. This was because China, Russia, and the East European countries recognised the Viet Minh government while the Western powers recognised the government headed by Bao Dai. Already the French who had entered the struggle rather overconfidently had been defeated by Giap and the whole area of northern Tonkin from the coast to the Laotian border as well as the territory adjoining China except for the major cities was under Communist control. The French army despondent, having been beaten in battle by an ill trained and poorly equipped guerilla force. The soldiers blamed the politicians in Paris and the politicians blamed the soldiers. To put an end to this bickering General De Lattre was appointed as New High Commissioner and Commander in Chief of Indo China. De Lattre was a born leader of men and his arrival in Decem-

ber 1950 in Saigon boosted the sagging French morale.

Giap on account of his success and reinforcements of arms received from communist China attacked the Red River Delta, the heart land of the territory still in French possession in Tonkin. The French repelled the Communist attack in early 1951. The French victory was entirely due to De Lattre whose authority was unquestioned and his resolve and determination of iron.

Giap defeated in the Delta started consolidating the Viet Minh hold over the North West, especially the area close to the Laotian border. By 1952 the Viet Minh were again becoming victorious. The man who could have checked the Viet Minh success was De Lattre but he was very ill and had to return to France where he died of cancer in January 1952. If any one could have won the war for France it was he. But he was dead and this was the signal for the Viet Minh to launch their offensive once more. Henri Navarre who succeeded De Lattre submitted a report that the French were tied down in hopelessly defensive positions. In order to block a Viet Minh incursion into Laos, Navarre captured Dien Bien Phu, a forward base near the Laotian frontier. This he did with a view to maintaining the morale of his troops and to show to Paris and Washington that the French forces were capable of winning the war. One has to bear in mind that since 1950 about 500 million dollars of U.S. aid annually was being provided to France to fight the Vietnam war.

Dien Bien Phu

The gamble to hold Dien Bien Phu was the undoing of France in Vietnam. It was of little strategic importance. Giap the Viet Minh Commander realized that if he could win a victory in the region, the French would be completely demoralised. In the second week of March 1954, Giap began his attack on Dien Bien Phu. The first phase began on 13th March and the three outlying posts were soon lost at a great cost in lives to the Communists. The Viet Minh now concentrated on shooting French planes bringing supplies for the soldiers. Giap surrounded the French position and while the French longed for more ammunition, the Viet Minh brought up more of their

own. The communists stopped all firing on 26th with the obvious motive of lulling the French into a false sense of security. On 30th March the massive communist assault began. By mid April 50,000 Viet Minh soldiers were in position and against all French calculations and to their utter surprise more and more artillery was brought in through mountains. The 16,000 French elite troops were hopelessly trapped. The French asked for further American aid which did not come. Giap began his final attack on 1st May at all points of the perimeter and the communists continued to advance regardless of casualties. Navarre realized his mistake but it was too late. On 7 May at about noon the Viet Minh 308th Division broke through the French defences forcing them to surrender. The news of the fall of Dien Bien Phu reached Geneva where the International conference to discuss the future of Indo China and Korea had just begun. The French occupation of Indo China after almost a hundred years of interrupted occupation was coming to an end. The writing was on the wall.

At Geneva the French had to accept the inevitable and they began to make plans for withdrawal from Indo-China. The Geneva conference ordered a cease fire. The conference declared Viet Nam an independent state temporarily divided near the 17th Parallel, the Viet Minh were to control the North and Bao Dai's government the South. Within two years general elections were to be held throughout Vietnam. Cambodia and Laos were to be independent. An International Commission comprising of Poland, Canada and India was to supervise the implementation of these decisions.

The intention that Vietnam should form one country was not realized by 1956. The latter story of the bitter and heroic struggle in Vietnam is too well known.

Egypt

Egyptian nationalism kept in check by Lord Kitchner and the existence of a large British Army erupted again after the First World War was over. The Wafd Party was well organised and dominated the political scene with its leader Zaghlul Pasha. In 1919 Zaghlul desired to present his case for Egyptian independence at the Paris Peace Conference and

hence fomented strikes and caused disturbances. He did succeed in attending the Conference but did not achieve anything. Early in 1920, despatched the Milner Commission to Egypt to consider the possibility of a new form of government. It recommended the creation of an independent Egypt ruled by a Constitutional monarchy and Parliament but this independence was limited by an alliance with Great Britain and the right of the British to maintain forces in Egypt to defend the Suez Canal. Negotiations however broke down in 1921 over Egyptian insistence that the British army should be confined to the Canal Zone.

The British Government made a unilateral declaration on February 28, 1922 that in future they would recognise Egypt as an "independent sovereign state" but four important subjects were reserved for further consideration viz.

- (i) Security of the communications of the British Empire in Egypt ;
- (ii) Defence of Egypt against foreign aggression ;
- (iii) Protection of the interests of foreigners and minorities in Egypt ;
- (iv) Future of Sudan.

This unilateral declaration which ended the Protectorate was not accepted by Egypt and yet a new constitution totally reactionary in character was imposed on "Independent" Egypt together with King Fuad who was vested with unbridled powers. He did what pleased him, dismissed Parliament at his sweet will and ruled like a dictator, always dependent on British force of arms which never let him down.

The British still had the right to defend the Suez Canal and Egypt, to protect foreign residents and to rule Sudan.

In Egypt the British government controlled finance, justice and the Department of Interior, in a nutshell everything of importance. The Egyptians demanded that the English should give up their control.

Elections to Parliament under the new constitution were held in 1923 and Zaghlul Pasha and his party, now known as the Wafd Party won 177 out of 214 seats. Zaghlul Pasha made a determined effort to come to terms with the British and for the purpose even visited London. Negotiations however broke down on account of lack of agreement on several ques-

tions including that of the future of Sudan. In fact the Sudanese people who showed their attachment to the Egyptian people, suffered immensely at the hands of the British for doing so.

The British Government always used to unquestioned obedience, felt upset at the obstinacy of Zaghlul and his colleagues and waited for an opportunity to teach a lesson to the Wafd Party and the Egyptian Parliament. As luck would have it opportunity was provided by the murder of Sir Lee Stack, Governor General of Sudan on November 19, 1924. The Wafd Party feared an attack and as expected within three days of this incident Lord Allenby, presented an ultimatum to the Egyptian Government and demanded among other things :

- (1) An apology and punishment of the criminals responsible for the crime ;
- (2) Prohibition of demonstrations and payment of an indemnity of £ 500,000 ; and
- (3) Withdrawal of all Egyptian troops from Sudan within twenty four hours.

What was most disturbing is the fact that the Egyptian government was held responsible for the murder of Sir Lee Stack especially when both the Police Chief at Carno and the Director of Public Safety were both Englishmen. It is these officials who ought to have been questioned but true to the real character of Imperialists the axe fell on the poor Government and its people. Zaghlul Pasha left with no choice acceded to most of the demands including the payment of £500,000 within twenty-four hours except withdrawal of Egyptian forces from Sudan. Having done this, Zaghlul Pasha tendered his resignation as a mark of protest against the high handedness of the English Government. In November, 1924 the King who was hand in glove with the British Government dissolved Parliament. As a consequence, Sudan officially became a British colony. The Egyptian troops in Sudan revolted but they were cruelly suppressed. An appeal was made to the League of Nations against what the Egyptian Parliament put it as "the exploitation of a tragic incident for Imperialist purposes", but the League turned a deaf ear. Britain had made capital out of the murder of Sir Lee Stack.

This heralded a period of continuous struggle between the

Wafd party on one side and the King and the British Government on the other. Till the new Parliament assembled in March 1925, King Fuad ruled like an autocrat. When the Parliament assembled it elected Zaghlul Pasha as the President of the Chamber of Deputies, something which neither the British Government nor King Fuad were willing to accept and so the Parliament was dissolved. It had lasted for just one day. In November 1925, members of the Egyptian Parliament met in defiance of the ban imposed by Government. King Fuad made a desperate attempt to change the constitution to keep Zaghlul Pasha and his Wafd Party out of office but this met with a hue and cry. Having failed in his attempt to keep the Zaghlulists out, King Fuad gave in and permitted elections under the old system. As expected Zaghlul Pasha and his party emerged triumphant victors, having captured 200 out of 214 seats. This was an example of Zaghlul's hold over his people. However, in spite of his majority, Zaghlul was not allowed to become Prime Minister because of the opposition of the British Government and another person was appointed. Zaghlul Pasha breathed his last on August 23rd, 1927. Thus passed away one of Egypt's dedicated and devoted leader who had given everything to the cause of Egyptian independence. After his death, Nahas Pasha became the leader of the Wafd party and in March 1928, the Prime Minister. In order to undermine his position and lower his prestige in the eyes of the public, Nahas Pasha, was accused of corruption, on the basis of a letter. In spite of the utmost efforts of the British Government and the King the case against Nahas Pasha failed and the charges levelled against him were held to be false. The Government banned the publication of this historic judgement—Historic of course in the eyes of the Egyptian people because the unscrupulous imperialists had failed.

King Fuad had, however utilized this opportunity to suspend Parliament, abolished the freedom of the Press and other civil liberties and clamped dictatorship upon the Egyptian people. All this King Fuad had been able to do with the strong backing of Lord Lloyd the British Commissioner in Egypt.

The year 1928, a year of trial and tribulation for the people of Egypt came to an end with the recall of Lord Lloyd.

Having lost the invaluable support of Lloyd, King Fuad agreed to have fresh elections to Parliament. As expected the Wafd party romped home an easy winner, capturing almost all the seats.

The Labour Government which had come to power in England relented and negotiations began again with Egypt. Nahas Pasha made a trip to London. The Labour Government conceded Nahas Pasha's view point on the first three reservations made in the declaration in 1922 but on the question of Sudan, the British Government refused to relent and the talks broke down. These negotiations had revealed far more understanding of each other's view point. It was a personal success for Nahas Pasha and his Wafd party but not appreciated by the British and Europeans together with the financiers. Soon after in June 1930 there was a conflict between King and Parliament and Nahas Pasha resigned.

The opportunity that King Fuad was looking for presented itself and he imposed a dictatorship and dissolved Parliament. This was the third dictatorship of his reign. In the same year 1930, King Fuad issued a decree giving the country a new constitution which curtailed the powers of Parliament and increased his own.

This is thus the story of the so-called independence of Egypt unilaterally announced by the British Government in February, 1922. These years from 1922-1930 provide a deep insight to the subtle functioning of modern Imperialism.

From 1930 onwards Egypt was under a dictatorial government, in theory a sovereign government but in reality a colony of the British government.

In 1935 Italy invaded Abyssinia and the apparent change in the situation and the prospect of a threat to Egypt resulted in Egypt and England coming to terms and a treaty was signed in 1936. The Palace continued to hate the Wafd party and British imperialism continued to be active behind the scenes. Under the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty the British were permitted to keep troops in the Canal Zone only—Egyptians were to be admitted to Sudan on the same terms as the British and Egypt was made responsible for the protection of minorities in Egypt. This treaty which lasted for twenty years was welcomed in both countries and was a decisive step

towards Egypt's genuine independence.

Four factors dominated the Egyptian scene from the end of the Second World War to 1952. Firstly an extreme and militant erupted into open violent activities. Negotiations with the British over the Sudan and the presence of British troops in the Canal Zone failed and finally led to the cancellation of the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty of 1936. Secondly, there was an increasing opposition to the King and the wealthy landlords. The pleasure loving King Farouk (1936-52) was most unpopular.

Thirdly, there was a desire for social reforms.

Lastly, the failure of the Arabs in the Palestine War had a profound effect on Egypt. The radicals now began to feel that there was need for the government to be overthrown. Eventually at mid-night on 22nd July, 1952 a group of middle ranking army officers led by Colonel Nasser along with the respectable and popular General Neguib went into action. Army units occupied key positions in Cairo. A revolution had taken place and the people were informed about the same by means of a broadcast. Three days later King Farouk to the accompaniment of a 21 gun salute sailed from Alexandria into exile.

The army leaders consolidated the Revolution, the monarchy was retained for one year during which Farouk's young son reigned and then the Republic was proclaimed.

China

At America's insistence came into being the policy known as the "Open Door". This meant that equal facilities were given to all foreign powers for trade in China.

This continuous aggression had frightened China and it was imperative that they should reorganise themselves to fight the Imperialists. Disappointed with the Emperor's attitude the Chinese people turned to the Dowager Empress Tz'u Hsi who was looked upon as a saviour. In fact she had been clever and unscrupulous power behind the throne in 1861, a forceful woman who dominated a decadent court, had arrested the fall of the dynasty at the expense of paralysing virtually dethroned and actually imprisoned, the Emperor Kuang Hsu for his part

for the sudden flood of reforms known as the Hundred Days of reform in 1898. The Empress Dowager by the force of her personality and the support of the conservatives held China stiff and rigid in the old hierarchic pattern. The last chance the monarchy had of leading a reforming government.

The fortunes of the Manchu dynasty were already at a low ebb when the situation was aggravated by two successive harvest failures and the Yellow River flooded large areas. This situation was exploited by a society called the Boxers. The Boxers was a patriotic reaction to foreign domination and exploitation of China. In the summer of 1900 the Boxers attacked Churches, murdered missionaries and destroyed foreign shops. The situation became so grave that the European nations, England, France, Russia, Germany and even USA sent an Allied Expeditionary force to suppress the rebellion. The force seized Peking and the Dowager Empress and the court fled westwards. Order was restored and the Boxer rebellion was ruthlessly crushed and the allied armies marched through China leaving a trail of death and suicide and burning villages. An English war correspondent wrote about the cruelties perpetrated in this manner: "There are things that I must not write, and may not be printed in England which would seem to show that this western civilization of ours is merely a veneer over savagery. The actual truth has never been written about any war and this will be no exception."

The armies on reaching Peking took position in the biggest looting excursion since the days of Pizarro took place in the city. China signed the Peking Protocol (1901) and accepted humiliating terms such as the stationing of a foreign military force in Peking, destruction of ports, extortion of war indemnity and execution of the patriotic leaders of Boxer movement.

The Manchu Dynasty had reached the point of no return. The mask of the corpse of the empire was fast decaying and when Empress died in 1908 the process of crumbling was accelerated and brought all to ruin. She is supposed to have said as she died: "Never again let the affairs of an empire be managed by a woman."

The revolution of 1911 began almost by accident. An

explosion in a house in Hankow in October 1911, led the police to the finding of a collection of arms and a list of the conspirators. The finding of a collection of arms and a list of the conspirators. The latter decided that an immediate revolt was their only chance. Attempts were made to check the tide of revolution but it was too late. On February 12, 1912 an Edict of Abdication was issued and thus disappeared the Manchu Dynasty. The Times, London gave the headline: "The Son of Heaven" has abdicated. The revolution marked the end of 2,132 years of imperial rule in China.

The Boxer movement though unsuccessful had inspired the growth of nationalism in China. The Chinese were fortunate that Dr. Sun Yat Sen appeared on the scene to guide the destinies of his nation. Sun Yat Sen was born near Canton in 1866 and had taken part in a rising against the Manchus in 1895 and Sun Yat Sen had to spend the next sixteen years in exile. In 1905 he founded in Tokyo a political party which in 1912 became the "Kuomintang". One of the early supporters was Chiang Kai Shek who was then undergoing military training in Japan. Sun Yat Sen had launched the revolution, intellectuals like Hu Shih and Chen Tuhisiu began the process of regeneration. Revolution and regeneration in the ultimate analysis converged in the Communist Party.

However, before new ideologies could take root in China the remnants of the old traditions that had persisted even after the revolution of 1911 had to be destroyed. In fact the revolution had not changed the basis of social order—the family system and the suppression of women and of course classical education.

Sun Yat Sen set up a democratic republican government. There was chaos and confusion because of the attitude of General Yuan who himself wanted to become emperor. In the interests of unity Sun Yat Sen resigned the presidency in Yuan's favour and China seemed to be apparently united. This unity in China only lasted four years. Yuan failed in his efforts to become emperor and his career ended in 1916 when he died.

After the death of Yuan till 1928 (that is from 1916-1928) there was complete anarchy prevailing in China. The western areas of Mongolia, Sinkiang and Tibet declared their independence while the rest of China was controlled by a

number of warlords who were engaged in internecine warfare to maintain their authority and position. This led to chaos and suffering in the countryside. In the south, the Republican Party under Sun Yat Sen established themselves in Canton, disowned the Peking government and claimed to be the only legitimate government of China. Unfortunately Sun Yat Sen's government was equally dependent on the fickle powers of the warlords. The generals in the South like their counterparts in the North were mercenaries and supported or betrayed a government for money.

Sad as it was the general balance in the countryside was upset. There was now no court to rebuke greedy officials. On the contrary there were hordes of soldiers, vagabonds in uniforms who went on pillaging, robbing and killing without punishment. The landlords in the villages who were solicitors for the welfare of the peasantry fled to the cities because of these disorders. The consequence was that little was heard of the distress of the countryside in the cities or abroad. Added to this, disastrous floods, famines, decline of inland trade, dislocation of communications, contributed to the ruination of the old order of society. The rule of the war-lords had annoyed both scholars and peasants, defied every moral restraint and destroyed any hope of improvement. These factors were the direct cause of the second phase of the Chinese revolution. One thing had become clear by 1920 that western democracy was not the solution and tacitly it was given up even by the revolutionaries.

These warlords had carved and recarved the man of China for over a decade. Alliances, betrayals, intrigues were the marked features in China after 1911. John K. Fairbank in his book *East Asia, The Modern Transformation* describes this period as a spiritual desert in which "the ancient confusion, ethical sanction and the ceremonial forms of imperial rule had lost their potency, while modern beliefs and institutions of popular government, either parties in competition or party dictatorship, had not yet become established.

During the period of confusion and chaos Sun Yat Sen directed all his energies to the maintenance of his outlawed party Kumintong. Meanwhile in the North China Marxist ideas began to develop and take shape especially among the

students. One of the well springs of Chinese communism was the May Four Movement of 1919. The student led demonstrations and the general strike in Shanghai convinced the majority of the Chinese intellectuals that alliance with the masses was the only way to revolution and regeneration.

The feeling of unrest and disappointment with the western countries in the days immediately prior to May 4 was later described in the following words by a Peking University graduate :

“When the news of the Paris Peace Conference finally reached us we were greatly shocked. We at once awoke to the fact that foreign nations were still selfish and militaristic and they were all great liars. To remember that night of May second very few of us slept. A group of my friends and I talked almost the whole night. We came to the conclusion that a greater world war would be coming sooner or later, and that this great war would be fought in the East. We had nothing to do with our government, that we knew very well, and at the same time we could no longer depend upon the principles of any so called great leaders like Woodrow Wilson, for example. Looking at our people and at the pitiful ignorant masses, we could not help but feel that we must struggle”.

In fact even before the demonstration of May fourth Ching Mon-lin said, “some of the leaders in the new educational movement who had been observing the spirit of unrest among the students predicted that something was going to happen.” The demonstration was in fact a protest against the traitors in the government and the resolutions of the Great powers at Paris. Paul S. Reinsch, the American Minister to China truly asserted that the Chinese were intensely disappointed and disillusioned at the decisions of the Paris Peace conference which meant the blasting of their hopes and the destruction of their confidence in the equity of nations.

The second source of Chinese Communism was the Russian Revolution of 1917. Before this year even the word Marxism was largely unknown. By 1919 Marxist group came into existence and within a decade Marxism had become the main stream of thought amongst both the communist and the non-communist intellectual circles.

In 1921 the Communist Party of China was formed at a

girls school in Shanghai and Mao Tse-tung was one of the official delegates at its first party meeting.

After these events, even Sun-Yat Sen who had received little support from the west concluded that even the Kuomintang ought to be reorganised on the lines of a Communist Party. Accordingly Chiang-Kai-Shek was sent to Russia to take a study of their government and party organisation and in 1923 the Russians sent Michael Borodin to China. Borodin's aim was to convert the Kuomintang into a centrally controlled mass party and to create a revolutionary army. A military academy was established near Canton with Chiang-Kai-Shek as the Director and the Communist Chou-En-Lai in charge of political activities. The Kuomintang under Russian influence formed an alliance with the Communist Party in 1923 and communists as the individuals were permitted to join the Kuomintang.

The alliance of the Kuomintang and the communists was an uneasy one because even though the Kuomintang was organised on Communist lines yet it did not adopt communist policies. In 1924 Sun Yat-Sen enunciated the policy of the Kuomintang which came to be known as the "Three Principles of the People". Firstly, nationalism—the Chinese people must unite and develop a spirit of nationhood in order to withstand foreign oppression ; secondly democracy—the ultimate aim was to be parliamentary democracy but, since the idea of democracy was foreign to the Chinese, a period of dictatorship under the Kuomintang was necessary first so that the people could be taught how to rule themselves ; and thirdly for people's livelihood moderate land reform was necessary with socialism as the ultimate object.

In March 1925, Sun Yat Sen died. Of him it has been said—"As Confucious had become the sage of ancient China so did Sun Yat Sen inherit the role in the 20th century"

The successor of Sun Yat Sen was Chiang Kai Shek, who always suspicious of the communists removed all of them from important party posts and by the summer of 1926, Chiang felt strong enough to begin the conquest of China. Starting from Canton he moved north with an ever-increasing army, and Kiangsi Hunan was followed by a series of bloody and unsuccessful uprisings in a number of cities in Central and

South China. Failure of the Canton commune, December 1927, finally convinced even a stubborn, always correct communist that the first wave of Chinese Revolution had passed by and over the Communists. The period between 1927 and 1931 was characterised by frequent shifts of party line and party leadership which always followed tactical failures in the Communist movement. It was during this period that Mao developed his famous four principles of guerilla warfare (1) when the enemy advances, we retreat (2) when the enemy halts and encamps, we trouble them, (3) when the enemy seeks to avoid a battle, we attack and (4) when the enemy retreats, we pursue.

Nevertheless the Communists learned several lessons in the years of formation, both from their failures and from their successes. Urged on by the new Stalinist line, they had hoped to control and even to capture the Kuomintang with its powerful, indigenous, revolutionary heritage. At no time did they control the military power of the Kuomintang. The Red Army ultimately filled the gap.

On the other hand in the formative years the Communist Party maintained intimate contact with Moscow and learned thoroughly Leninist concepts of party organisation. Marxism-Leninism had made vast inroads among the Chinese intelligentsia and the Communists had acquired wide and practical experience in mass leadership. Marxism, Leninism Stalinism still had to be adjusted to the peculiar Chinese scene, Mao-Tse-Tung was eventually to fill the gap. By 1933, Mao-Tse-Tung was in full control of the Chinese Communism.

The Chinese Soviet Republic set up in 1931 was a precarious and shortlived organisation, and abandoned by the Communists themselves, somewhat informally in 1937. This however represented a remarkable comeback, resurrection from the previous failures.

The nationalists finally embarked on their long campaign to suppress the Communists by force. Chiang Kai Shek had a million troops round the communists and early in 1934 he built a circle of fortified posts round their positions. With the situation becoming menacing Mao decided to break out and leave Hunan and in October 1934, the communist army of about 100,000 set out on the epic Long March. In the face of

superior armies, the communists were continuously on the move and continued westwards to the desolate regions on the borders of Tibet and then moved northwards. This march became legendary. The communists trekked more than 6,000 miles through eleven provinces gathering new recruits. The communists were weary and face to face with destruction but were not altogether ready to give up. Of the 100,000 who set out only 20,000 finally arrived in Shensi late in 1935. The survivors were in a battered condition but temporarily out of the reach of the Kuomintang forces. They were joined by other Communists and by 1937 Mao-Tse-Tung was the ruler of over ten million people. Sorets were set up in the villages of Shensi and Kansu. The base for the eventual communist conquest of China had been established.

Edgar Snow, an American journalist, in his book "Red Star over China" written in 1937 said of the Long March—Adventure, exploration, discovery, human courage and cowardice, ecstasy and triumph, suffering, sacrifice and loyalty and then through it all, like a flame, this undermined ardour and undying hope and amazing revolutionary optimism of those thousands of youths who would not admit defeat either by man or God or death—all this and more are embodied in the history of an Odyssey unequalled in modern times—According to Tiboir Menok, Professor of Political Science at the University of Parish, there were three results of the Long March. First the communists became heroes throughout the country, second the communist party achieved a new internal cohesion and third contact with peasants and tribesmen in different parts of China gave them a new insight into the minds of the people. Mende concludes "Thus with their moral stature grown but physically and numerically weakened the communists began to organise their new base".

Kuomintang pressure against the communists ceased after the Sain incident (December 1936) in which Chiang Kai Shek was arrested by Hsueh-liang son of a Manchurian warlord. Chiang was forced to agree to a united front with the communists. When Chiang returned to Nanking, he publicly repudiated the Sain agreement. Nevertheless the attacks on the communists gradually ceased and a stronger line was adopted

towards Japanese expansion. This gave the communists the breather they so desperately needed. The Japanese attack levered Kuomintang power off its base of prematurely modern coastal China and made it possible for the communists as patriotic anti-Japanese guerillas, to infiltrate large areas behind enemy lines. Mao-Tse-Tung truly asserted that the Sino-Japanese War gives the Chinese Communists an excellent opportunity to grow.

The Chinese Communist Party in 1936 and 1937 showed itself to be the most adaptable Communist Party on earth. From 1937 to the proclamation of the Peoples republic in 1949, the Chinese Communists were severe and shrewed in their use of semantics. They let the Nationalists keep all the titles and the lables ; all they wanted was real power, power in terms of acres of farmland, companies and battalion of armed, able-bodied men, party organisation controlling entire communities. In terms of administrative procedure the Communist Party took over governmental functions which Communists had previously attempted to carry out with the administrative device of the Chinese Soviet Republic.

In Octobe 1937, the Communist Party resolved to further strengthen the United Front by eliminating rivals and extending regional activities in order to win for the Communist Party a status equal to and competitive with that of the Kuomintang. Mao-Tse-Tung declared that our policy is to devote 70 per cent of our effort to our own expansion, 20 per cent to fighting the Japanese. This policy is to be carried out in three stages : During the first stage we are to compromise with the Kuomintang in order to ensure our existence and growth. During the Second stage we are to achieve a parity in strength with the Kuomintang. During the third stage we are to penetrate deep into parts of Central China to establish bases for attack on the Kuomintang.

The Kuomintang and the Communists came into clash with each other rather frequently. In 1940 when two divisions of the Communist Army were engaged in fighting against the Japanese south of the yellow River. Chiang apprehensive that the Communists were eventually aiming at controlling the Port of Shanghai ordered the communist forces to cross the

Yangtze Kiang river. This he had done in order to foil the designs of the Communists. As expected, the Chinese Communist forces refused to comply with the orders on the ground that, "their withdrawal would cause a vacuum in occupied territory and that their crossing the Yangtze, heavily guarded by the Japanese artillery was dangerous and risky". This defiance led to military measures being initiated against the Communist army by the Kuomintang forces in January 1941 in the Anhwei region. This resulted in the death of Six thousand Communist soldiers. Mao-Tse-Tung legitimately accused Chiang Kai Shek of manouvering this tragic episode. Chiang hated the Communists bitterly and regarded the Japanese as a disease of the skin and the Communists as a disease of the heart.

For a period of ten long years, th Communists had managed, governed and developed an area larger than the territory of a medium sized European State. They had governed this nation seized countryside without benefit of a central government. By 1940's they had become as careful in avoiding the premature responsibilities of government as they had been reckless in their earlier years. Continuous struggle had made them realize that what really mattered in revolutionary struggle as ideological, political and economic control not just the apparatus of government.

The Chinese Communists impressed the populace by their honesty, intrinsic devotion and sacrifice. Mao-Tse-Tung and Chou-en-Lai reorganised, the Communist Party. When in August 1945 Japan surrendered, China was freed from foreign rule.

The tension between Kuomintang and the communists, which warring parties to negotiate. This policy tended to be partially successful in that Mao-Tse-Tung even flew to Chungking to meet Chiang Kai Shek in September 1945. Tension had reached a high point by December 1945, when the Marshall Peace Mission arrived in China. Marshall made a brave effort to end the hostilities but the intransigence of both sides moved the dispute from the conference table to the battle field. Marshall's terms were not acceptable to either party because each wanted nothing less than a complete victory.

In the early months of 1946, although the Marshall

truce nominally held in China within the Great Wall, it had no effect on Manchuria. The Nationalist forces had occupied Jehol province (in Western Manchuria) in November 1945. This was an attempt to block communications between Manchuria and Yen-an. In March 1946, the communists and the Nationalists forces fought each other at Mukden when the Russians left. In April the communists captured Changchun, the former capital of Manchurkiro, when the Russians departed and the communists quietly took over vast areas of Northern Manchuria vacated by the Russians as also the provinces of Heilungkiang and Kirin. In May the Nationalists succeeded in driving out the communists from Changchun and Kirin. By June 1946 civil war had begun and started spreading in Manchuria and at the same time the truce in China had broken down and general civil war which covered the whole of China began.

Immediately after the break-down of truce full scale civil war began. The Nationalists tried to conquer Shantung province and open communications between Nanking and Peking but failed to do so. The Communists commanded by General Chen Yi avoided major battles, abandoned deserted cities, continued to keep the communications cut and by such methods brought the Nationalist offensive to a grinding halt. Elsewhere the Nationalists did achieve impressive victories. They advanced north-west of Peking into Inner Mongolia and in March 1947 captured the war time communist capital of Yen-an. This was made out to be a major victory and since the people had not heard about it, it was regarded as an impressive achievement. The truth was that it was not defended. The communists had shifted their administration and main forces to Honan and Shantung where they blocked the only railways from the Yongtze to Peking and Manchuria. The so called success was deceptive for the communists continued to muster forces and deliberately avoided a show down.

From January to June 1947 the Nationalists were engaged in furious battles with the communists in Northern Manchuria around KIRIN. In May the Nationalists suffered a terrible defeat and in June 1947 the communists captured the South Eastern port of Manchuria, the Liaotung Peninsula together with the cities of Antung and Liao-Yong. The Nationalists, it

is believed lost fifty per cent of their armed forces in the region by the end of 1947 the Nationalist armies had been bottled up in major cities in Manchuria, they did not have control on the country side which had slipped out of their hands into those of the communists. During this period also the communists succeeded in occupying the whole province of Shansi except its capital Taiyuan. In August 1947 the communists launched a counter offensive in central China which ran through the Tapieh Shan mountains which divide Honan from Hupeh, where they established a new base. They moved south east wards towards Nanking and succeeded in driving out the Nationalists from Shantung. The attempt on the part of the Nationalists to open land communications with North China had entirely failed. The Nationalists had thus lost territory which they had controlled in 1946 and their armies in Manchuria were being surrounded in the two important cities of Changchun and Mukden. Rail links with Peking were cut and the only communication was by air. Under the garb of spurious Nationalist victories in the North west the balance of war had tilted in favour of the communists. In spite of heavy losses the Nationalist forces were twice as much of those of the communists at the end of 1947 and also had air superiority and control. There was now a general belief that the war would end in a communist victory.

Chiang Kai Shek's American military advisers were becoming concerned at the rapidly deteriorating conditions. Chiang Kai Shek mistakenly hoped that if the situation became critical, America would come to his rescue but America was really in no mood to embark on another major war in Asia. The apparent control of the major cities by the Nationalists and the fact that the journalists could not find access to communist lines blinded opinion about the harsh reality. Chiang still ruled in China but his position was undermined by corruption, infiltration and declining morale. Only a strong push was really needed to send the whole edifice tumbling.

Lin Piao who was then the communist Commander-in-Chief in Manchuria began his offensive against the Nationalist strong holds in January 1948. He captured Kirin and the important railway junction of Szupingkai. As a result the Nationalist forces were besieged in the two main garrison

towns Changchun and Mukden. The only way of supplying them the essentials was by airlifting them and if they would not be relieved before the onset of winter they would be left with no alternative but to surrender. Chiang Kai Shek's only hope was to land troops on the South-West Coast of Manchuria at the small port of HULUTAO and with the assistance of the forces at MUKDEN to try to reopen the railway lines from that city to HULUTAO. In the summer Chiang built a huge force of 11 divisions at HULUTAO. Meanwhile the spring of 1948 saw the growing decline of the Nationalist position in Central China. In March the communist forces recaptured Yen-an and pushed the Nationalists south-westwards but failed to move into SZECHUAN. In April they crossed into Honan from their base in Shansi province and occupied LOYANG capital of HONAN and in May inflicted a crushing defeat on the Nationalists at KAIFENG, capital of Eastern Honan. During this period the Communists shifted their main thrust of action eastwards into Central China, where they hoped to come across and destroy the large Nationalist forces north of Nanking. On 24th September, they took the capital of Shantung, TSINAN by assault. This was really the first large city to be occupied by the communists who were now changing their strategy from guerrilla warfare to battles between set formations. The fall of TSINAN was significant and was indicative of this change. In fact the communist leaders had rejected the Russian advice to carry on with guerrilla warfare and decided that the time had come to strike a decisive blow.

As autumn advanced, the Nationalists still held MUKDEN and Changchun in Manchuria, Peking and Tientsin and the country connecting them in HOPEH and most of China South of the Lung Hai railway and HUAI river as also the western and north-western provinces. In October LIN Piao attacked Chinchou in Manchuria, prevented the reinforcements from reaching the forces and forced the garrison of 100,000 men to surrender with all their equipment and ammunition. Chiang Kai Shek foresaw that unless an attempt to carve out a passage to Mukden was made, the fate of his 400,000 strong forces was sealed. Chang chun had already fallen on 20th October, and five Nationalist divisions with all

their equipment had surrendered to the communists. On 27th October and the next two days LIN Piao attacked the Nationalists from the front, rear and flanks. In seventy two hours the Communists totally destroyed the entire Nationalist army in Mukden killing its Commander and forcing the city to surrender. The eleven divisions which had been sent to HULUTAO were withdrawn by sea. The Nationalists had lost 400,000 men mostly by way of prisoners of war and also the arsenal at Mukden which was undoubtedly the very best in China.

This was followed by the movement of the Communist forces South-wards. By the end of October they were near Tientsun and approaching Peking. To the South, it was obvious that the last strength of the Nationalists would be around LUNGHAI railway to defend the approach to Nanking and the Yangtze valley. The communist armies of the Central front were now concentrating in this region and Lin Piao's big Manchurian army could move south-wards to reinforce them. Cut off Peking and Tientsun were left alone without any hope of salvation. The battle of Huai Hai (short name for Lung Hai railway and Huai river) began in November on the grounds, which throughout the Chinese history had been the site of great decisive battles. The forces were almost equal 600,000 men on each side. The task of defending their positions was very difficult, well nigh impossible and in this battle it is found that the Nationalists lost 600,000 soldiers, but out of which 327,000 were taken prisoners. It was the end. Chiang gave up the Presidency and the Communist armies advanced to the banks of Yangtze Kiang.

As early as November 1948 General David Bor had made the following report to the U.S. military department "I am convinced that the military situation has deteriorated to the point where only active participation of U.S. troops could affect a remedy—military material and economic aid in my opinion is less important to the salvation of China than other factors. No battle has been lost since my arrival due to the lack of communication or equipment. The Nationalists debacle in my opinion can all be attributed to the worlds' worst leadership and many other morale-destroying factors that can lead to a complete loss of will to fight. The complete ineptness of high

military leaders and the widespread corruption and dishonesty throughout the armed forces could, in some measure, have been controlled and directed had the above authority and facilities been available. Chinese leaders lack the moral courage to issue and enforce unpopular decision."

For nearly four months in the late winter and spring of 1949 there was a lull. The Nationalist Government under the provisional President Li Tsung-Jen tried to negotiate with the Chinese Communist leaders. Peking had been taken after a siege of six weeks and Tientsin had been captured in January. The negotiations broke down because of the opposition of the supporters of Ching Kai shek. The Communists crossed the Yangtze in force, took Nanking in April 1949, Shanghai in May and by the end of the year had occupied all the Southern and Western provinces where the local commanders supported them and offered no resistance. Canton was occupied in October and in December the last city in distant ZECHUAN surrendered.

On October 1, 1949, the announcement of "The Central Governing Council of the Peoples Government of Peking" was made by Mao-Tse-Tung to the deafening roar of thousands in Peking. From that date, the Communists set about the task of creating the rule of the people, not the proletariat, the end of exploitation not absolute equality.

Only mopping up operations were required to bring the whole of China under control. The communists had risen from a guerrilla army to a vast, well equipped conventional army which had conquered one of the largest countries in the world.

Chassin who commanded the French Air Forces in Indo-China from 1951 to 1953 in his book "The Communist Conquest of China" ascribes Mao's victory to the triumph of an idea over military might and adds "The profound lesson of the drama which was the Chinese civil war is this: Even now in this era of materialism and mechanisation, spirit is always predominant, and it is morale that wins battles. Superiority in manpower and material means little if men make no use of their weapons." This in essence sums up the reasons for the communist success in China.

Not only this, the success of the Communists was also

due to other factors some of which were :

1. The Japanese aggression was a blessing in disguise for the Chinese Communists. It not only kept the Kuomintang forces occupied but also resulted in the impoverishment of the Chiang government. Corruption was rampant among the Government officials who were engaged in self aggrandisement and they thus lost the sympathy of the people and stood discredited in their eyes. They thus failed to arouse the people to fight against the Communists.

2. The Kuomintang relied heavily on the landed gentry and the capitalists and ignored the peasants which formed the majority of the population. The Communists had this one asset—manpower. "What is the most precious thing on earth ? It is man.....our people are poor and blank. But the most beautiful poem can be written on a blank sheet of paper," thus wrote Mao. The common man was won over by promises of agrarian reforms, by their systematic and sustained propaganda and above all by their honesty, intrinsic devotion, austerity, simplicity and sacrifices.

3. Sincerity of purpose and ever solicitous for the welfare won them unstinted support and cooperation of the people during the civil war with the Kuomintang forces. Above all, the Communist forces were a model of discipline and did not ever engage in looting the urban population and respected the women folk. In such conditions success of the Communists was inevitable and in fact it was a foregone conclusion.

The Nationalists lost the war because they were badly led, followed wrong strategy, were corrupt. The Communists won because they had a disciplined and dedicated army, were accepted as liberators by the peasantry, concerned their strategy on sound principles and executed their operations with brilliant tactics. They had no air cover or any Air Force at all, the Nationalist Superiority in equipment and weapons remained intact until the end as did their command of the air. It did not help them at all. Yet the Communists won because they were superbly disciplined and treated the population with scrupulous honesty and fairness whereas the Nationalist forces were all paid and encouraged to loot and plunder so as to live off the people. The Nationalists had fallen in the estimation of the people.

16000

**PUBLICATIONS FOR
I.A.S (NEW SCHEME) S.B.I. AND RESERVE
BANK OFFICERS, ASSTT. GRADE, N.D.A.
C.D.S., C.A. ENT. EXAMS. ETC.
BOOKS FOR CIVIL SERVICES EXAM. (MAIN)**

Compulsory	Rs.
1. Bookhive's General Studies for C.S. (Main) Paper I & II 5(th Edition Revised & Enlarged)	60.00
2. Essentials of Interview for I.A.S. and Banks Exams. etc.	25.00
3. English for Civil Services Exam. by Prof. Ravi Chopra	27.00
4. Hindi for Civil Services Exam.	18.00

Optional	
5. History for Paper I (Ancient and Medieval India)	55 00
6. History Paper II (Modern India) (1757-1947)	28.00
7. History Paper II (Modern World)	40.00
8. General Sociology for Paper I by Prof. J.L. Kachroo	35.00
9. Society in India (Sociology for Paper II) by Prof. J.L. Kachroo and Vijay Kachroo, D.A.V. College New Delhi.	35.00
10. International Relations by I.A.S. Study Circle for Pol. Sc. Paper II	40.00
11. Political Science (Theory)	35 00
12. Comparative Politics and Indian Political System	35.00
13. Western & Indian Political Thinkers (A Study of Selected Political Thinkers)	45.00
14. Economics for Paper I	36.00
15. Indian Economic Development Paper II	40.00
16. Advanced Essays (Revised & Enlarged Edition)	22.00

Law	
17. Law of Torts by Arun Kumar, Faculty of Law, Delhi University	45.00
18. Administrative Law by T.S. Batra, Reader Faculty of Law Delhi University, Delhi.	75.00
19. International Institutions by T.S. Batra, Delhi University	60.00
20. Criminal Law (Abridged and Revised) by T.S. Batra	90.00

CIVIL SERVICES EXAM. (PRELIMINARY)

Objective Type	
1. Bookhive's New General Studies for C.S. (Preliminary)	55.00
2. Agriculture 30.00 3. Political Science 50.00 4. Indian History	45.00
5. Commerce 54.00 6. Economics 45.00 7. Sociology 30.00 8. Physics	55.00
9. Chemistry 30.00 10. Botany 25.00 11. Zoology	25.00
12. Mathematics 30.00 13. Law (Exhaustive & Comprehensive)	45.00
14. Indian Constitution 14.00 15. Indian Constitution (Text)	20.00
16. Elect. Engg. 3500 17. Indian Economy	20.00

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. State Bank Officer's Guide	50.00	6. CDS Guide	30.00
2. Agriculture Bank Officer's Guide	52.00	7. UPSC Syllabus for C.S. (Prel. and Maint. Exam.	8.00
3. Constitutional Develop- ment & National Move- ment in India	40.00	8. Bank/Probationary Officer's Exam. Guide by Prof. Ravi Chopra.	50.00
4. Gandhism	3.50	9. L.I.C. Guide	45.00
5. Civil Services (Main) Exam. Papers all subjects available		10. NDA Guide	30.00
12. Agriculture Clerks (Agri. Assistants & Agri. Field Assistants)		11. Tips for Bank Recruitment	20.00
			20.00

BOOKHIVE

PUBLISHERS FOR COMPETITIVE EXAM.

CB-231, Ring Road, Naraina

NEW DELHI-110028